DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 434 24 CG 006 599

AUTHOR	Knight, Brent Malcolm
TITLE	A Study of the Determinants of Idiosyncrasy Credit. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-E-017
PUB DATE	Jun 71
GRANT	OEG-5-71-0016(509)
NOTE	154p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavioral Science Research, *Behavior Theories, Community Colleges, *Conformity, *Group Status, Individual Differences, Individual Power, Leadership Styles, *Social Behavior, Task Performance

ABSTRACT

An investigation of a theory of "idiosyncrasy credit" which was developed by Hollander (1958) as a framework for understanding status and conformity, was undertaken in the community college setting. Idiosyncrasy credit represents status and allows for behavior which may exceed the "limits" set by the common expectancies of a group. The specific purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency, external status, recent idiosyncratic behavior, duration of group affiliation, appearance and grooming, speaking ability, and selected personality and demographic variables. The data obtained in this study indicated that there was a strong positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and (1) task competency and (2) status external to the group. Such findings concur with Hollander's (1958) theory of idiosyncrasy credit. The relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and (1) idiosyncratic behavior and (2) appearance and grooming were somewhat inconsistent, and it was therefore concluded that such variables may fluctuate according to the situation. A positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and speaking ability was found; yet, speaking ability was highly correlated with the items which comprised task competency. (Author/TA)

PA 24
BR 1-E-017
CG

ED053434

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 1-E-017
Contract No. OEG-5-71-0016(509)

A STUDY OF THE DETERMINANTS OF IDIOSYNCRASY CREDIT

Brent Malcolm Knight
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

June, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 006 599

ED053434

Final Report

Project No. 1-E-017
Contract No. OEG-5-71-0016(509)

A Study of the Determinants of Idiosyncrasy Credit

Brent Malcolm Knight

Western Michigan University

Kalamazoo, Michigan

June, 1971

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I received assistance from a number of sources in conducting this research project. I am pleased to have an opportunity to acknowledge the sources from which assistance was received.

Dr. Harold W. Boles served as chairman of my doctoral committee, was project director of this study, and provided needed assistance in the writing of the final report.

Drs. Theodore L. Ploughman and William D. Coats generously offered their technical expertise regarding statistical models.

Dr. Cameron W. Lambe provided needed suggestions in the preparation of the final report.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Donna for her assistance, encouragement, and perseverance.

Brent Malcolm Knight

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES. vi

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

Problem Statement 2

Significance of the Study 3

Purpose of the Study. 4

Assumptions 5

Limitations 5

Definitions of Terms. 6

Organization of the Dissertation. 8

II THE THEORY OF IDIOSYNCRASY CREDIT AND RELATED RESEARCH. 10

The Theory of Idiosyncrasy Credit 10

Research on the Theory. 14

III DESIGN OF THE STUDY. 21

Overview of Procedure 21

Hypotheses and Questions Explored 22

Sources of Data 25

Methods of Gathering Data 28

Instrumentation 32

Methods of Analyzing Data 37

IV REPORT OF THE FINDINGS 42

Analysis of Instrumentation 43

Research Hypotheses 45

CHAPTER PAGE

Research Questions 53

Summary. 75

V SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS. 77

Summary. 77

Discussion of the Findings 80

Conclusions. 87

Implications 89

REFERENCES. 92

APPENDICES. 96

A. Definitions of the Scales and Indices Yielded by The Adjective Check List 97

B. Instrumentation. 106
  Nomination Form 107
  Form R. 108
  Adjective Check List. 109
  Demographic Information Form. 111

C. Communications 112
  Reminder Notice 1 113
  Reminder Notice 2 114
  Introductory Letter to the Target Subjects. 115
  Introductory Letter to the Non-Target Subjects. . . 116

D. Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations. 117
  Social Science Division, College Alpha. 118
  Science Division, College Alpha 119
  Humanities Division, College Beta 120
  Mathematics Division, College Beta. 121
  Social Science Division, College Gamma. 122
  Mathematics Division, College Gamma 123

E. Number and Per Cent of Subject Responses 124
  "Form R Packet" Research. 125
  Adjective Check List. 126
  Demographic Information Form. 127

APPENDICES (Continued) PAGE

F. Supplemental Analyzed Data. 128
  Form R Inter-Correlation Matrix. 129
  Form R Factor Matrix 130
  Form R Analyzed Data 131
  Demographic Information Form Analyzed Data 134
  Adjective Check List Analyzed Data 138

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1 Number and Per Cent of Subject Responses for the Idiosyncrasy Credit Nomination Form 30

2 Rotated Factor Matrix of Form R. 44

3 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Perceived Task Competency 46

4 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Perceived External Status 47

5 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Idiosyncratic Behavior. 49

6 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Duration of Group Affiliation 50

7 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Intraception 51

8 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Affiliation. 52

9 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Age 54

10 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Earned College Degrees. 55

11 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Academic Honors 56

12 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership in Professional Organizations. 57

13 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Published Journal Articles. 58

14 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Published Books or Monographs 59

15 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership in Social, Community, or Church Organizations 60

TABLE PAGE

16 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and the Holding of an Office Within Social, Community, or Church Organizations 61

17 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership on College Committees. 62

18 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and the Sex of the Nominee for All Colleges Combined. 63

19 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Self-Confidence 65

20 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Dominance. 66

21 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Achievement. 67

22 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Heterosexuality. 68

23 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Aggression 69

24 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Abasement. 70

25 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Deference. 71

26 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Exhibition 72

27 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Appearance and Grooming 73

28 Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Speaking Ability. 74

29 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Social Science Division, College Alpha. 118

30 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Science Division, College Alpha 119

31 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Humanities Division, College Beta 120

TABLE PAGE

32 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Science and Mathematics, College Beta 121

33 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Social Science Division, College Gamma. 122

34 Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations Science and Mathematics Division, College Gamma . . 123

35 Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning Form R Packets. 125

36 Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning the Adjective Check List. 126

37 Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning the Demographic Information Form. 127

38 Form R Inter-Correlation Matrix. 129

39 Form R Factor Matrix 130

40 Form R Analyzed Data 131

41 Demographic Information Form Analyzed Data 134

42 Adjective Check List Analyzed Data 138

ABSTRACT

An investigation of a theory of "idiosyncrasy credit" which was developed by Hollander (1958) as a framework for understanding status and conformity, was undertaken in the community college setting. Idiosyncrasy credit represents status and allows for behavior which may exceed the "limits" set by the common expectancies of a group.

Hollander hypothesized that the three general variables which are determinants of idiosyncrasy credit are: (1) task competency, (2) individual characteristics, and (3) immediate past idiosyncratic behavior. The relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the aforementioned determinants had not been investigated in a social system in education or in any setting outside the laboratory so far as was known.

The intent of this study was to investigate the theory of idiosyncrasy credit in an on-going social system in education. The specific purpose was to investigate the relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency, external status, recent idiosyncratic behavior, duration of group affiliation, appearance and grooming, speaking ability, and selected personality and demographic variables.

The sample of the population utilized in this study consisted of 140 faculty members within six academic divisions of three

Michigan community colleges.

Awareness of the idiosyncrasy credit levels of the subjects was gained through the administration of a nomination form which asked faculty members to nominate, from a list of faculty names in their divisions, the names of the five persons whom they perceived to have the highest amount of idiosyncrasy credit and the five with the lowest. The five individuals with the greatest number of high nominations and the five with the greatest number of low nominations were then rated by their peers regarding their competencies, status and behavior, and each was asked to complete the Adjective Check List and a demographic information form regarding himself.

The primary data analyses consisted of comparisons between the high and low nominees on each of the variables studied. The statistical models used consisted of the t test, chi-square, or the Mann-Whitney U test. Where appropriate, the strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and the variables was also computed.

The data obtained in this study indicated that there was a strong positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and (1) task competency and (2) status external to the group. Such findings concur with Hollander's (1958) theory of idiosyncrasy credit.

The relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and (1) idiosyncratic behavior and (2) appearance and grooming were somewhat inconsistent, and it was therefore concluded that such variables may fluctuate according to the situation. A positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and speaking ability was found, but a factor analysis of the rating instrument used revealed that speaking ability was highly correlated with the items which comprised task competency.

The data showed that there was a tendency for women to receive fewer high idiosyncrasy credit nominations than men. The results also revealed that in general the high nominees wrote more journal articles and tended to have earned more college degrees than the low nominees. No consistent relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and age, academic honors, membership in organizations or committees, number of published books or monographs, or duration of group affiliation. The failure to find a consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and duration of group affiliation was inconsistent with Hollander's theory and previous laboratory research.

Although no strong relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and the personality scales and indices investigated, a number of tendencies were noted. Positive relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and self-confidence, need for dominance, need for achievement, need for heterosexuality, need for aggression, and need for exhibition. Negative relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and need for abasement (express inferiority) and need for deference (seek subordinate roles).

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In attempting to understand individual behavior and the group process, observers have been perplexed by the differences in behavioral limits which exist among group members. Moreover, leaders have expressed concern that in a group setting, certain prestigious individuals can exhibit behavior that would bring prompt and punitive sanctions upon lesser individuals. Such an observation and an awareness of research on the subject prompted Hollander (1958) to construct the theory of "idiosyncrasy credit."

Hollander's theory and model of idiosyncrasy credit are comprehensive in their treatment of status and conformity. Idiosyncrasy credit may be considered as the positive impressions of a person held by others. Credit represents status and allows variant behavior, innovation, and the assertion of influence. Idiosyncrasy credit is supposed to be measured by the degree to which an individual may exceed the "limits" set by the common expectancies of the group.

Hollander's theory, however, is largely lacking empirical validation. The use of a theory which lacks the verification of research could be problematic. Until proven, a theory is a mere hypothetical construct and may be incongruent with real and observable phenomena. One can readily foresee that a serious problem might result from the application in practice of an incorrect theory. In a research sense, the use of an unproven theory as an assumption for further research requires special care to assure valid research. Before Hollander's theory is considered valid, it should have the benefit of rigorous testing. Travers (1964) stated that a theory marks the point of departure from which a successful exploration of educational phenomena is made. It was therefore appropriate that Hollander's theory serve as the basis for research. The intent of the investigator in this study was to investigate a portion of the idiosyncrasy credit theory which lacked validation and thus to provide the behavioral sciences and especially the field of educational administration with some basic empirical data. In summary, the investigator sought to accept, reject, or modify a portion of Hollander's theory.

Problem Statement

Hollander (1958) hypothesized that the three general variables which are determinants of idiosyncrasy credit are: (1) task competency, (2) individual characteristics, and (3) immediate past idiosyncratic behavior. The variables of task competency and immediate past idiosyncratic behavior have been previously investigated in laboratory studies, but were lacking verification of their association with idiosyncrasy credit in a field situation. Also, the specific individual characteristics which are associated with idiosyncrasy credit have not been investigated in any setting, so far as was known. The relationships of the nature of the local situation to the various variables also had not been investigated. Moreover, none of the variables had been investigated in an educational setting.

Significance of the Study

The major significance of this study was in the partial investigation of a theory. This study provides original data on selected variables which were suspected of being associated with idiosyncrasy credit.

The testing of Hollander's theory in an educational field setting may allow educational administration practitioners and theorists to interpret the theory of idiosyncrasy credit as applied to the educational scene. Testing of the theory in an action setting outside the laboratory removed the elements of artificiality and may allow for increased generalizability.

The interdisciplinary scope of the present investigation may provide the disciplines of Sociology and Psychology with empirical data on idiosyncrasy credit and group interaction. Thus, disciplines other than Education may be able to use the findings as a basis for research and for integration into their respective bodies of knowledge.

In an applied sense, educational administrators have available a theory which has had the benefit of testing in the field of education. The theory could allow administrators to have a better understanding of the actions and interactions of their teaching faculties as groups. Awareness of Hollander's theory and of the findings of this study might allow practicing educational administrators to recognize individuals with high potential for influence and to promote them accordingly. Recognition of faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit and corresponding low potential for influence could allow for constructive steps to be taken to help such individuals to be more successful within their groups. Knowledge of the theory and of the findings of this study also could serve the practicing administrator by allowing him to better understand how a potential employee might fit into a group.

This study was innovative in its research design. Community college instructors were asked to nominate and rate each other on a variety of factors. This study demonstrated that peer nominations and ratings could be successfully conducted, and that high and low idiosyncrasy credit holders could be successfully identified within academic divisions through peer nomination.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to investigate a selected number of variables which Hollander (1958) theorized were associated with idiosyncrasy credit. This study also sought to investigate a number of selected variables which were suspected to be associated with idiosyncrasy credit. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency, external status, recent idiosyncratic behavior, duration of group affiliation, appearance and grooming, speaking ability, and selected personality and demographic variables in various local situations.

Assumptions

This study was conducted with six underlying assumptions, as follow.

1. Among a given group of individuals, the group ascribes varying amounts of idiosyncrasy credit to its members.
2. The combined terms of "status" and "freedom to deviate", as used in the Nomination Form, represent idiosyncrasy credit.
3. Faculty members within community college divisions are capable of rating their divisional peers on competency, appearance, status, speaking ability, and freedom to deviate from group expectancies.
4. Faculty members within a given community college division are a group in a sociological sense.
5. The sample of community college divisions used within this study is representative of two-year, comprehensive, public, community college divisions with a size of fifteen to thirty faculty members.
6. The sample of community college instructors is representative of instructors in two-year, comprehensive, public community colleges.

Limitations

This study was conducted under the following limitations.

1. The findings of this study were viewed as relationships, and therefore no causal inferences were made.
2. The study was limited to faculty members within divisions consisting of fifteen to thirty faculty members each.
3. It was limited to faculty members within six divisions of three Michigan comprehensive, two-year, public, community colleges.
4. It was limited to the objectives specifically included in the design.

Definitions of Terms

Theoretical Definitions

1. *Conformity* is behavior which is consistent with a social expectancy.
2. *Deviant behavior* is a series of actions, by an individual or a group, which fall outside the expectation limits accorded to the specific individual or group by a larger collectivity (Boles, 1969).
3. *External status* represents an accumulation of the positively disposed impressions of an individual which originated outside the focal activities of the group.
4. *Group* is a term which describes a collectivity of individuals having a common purpose or goal and having communication with each other (Boles, 1969).
5. *Idiosyncratic behavior* is any group member's behavior which may be perceived by the group to deviate from a given group expectancy (Hollander, 1958).
6. *Idiosyncrasy credit* is an accumulation of positively disposed impressions residing in the perceptions of relevant others (Hollander, 1958).
7. *Nonconformity* is behavior which is inconsistent with a social expectancy.
8. *Relevant other* is a person whose behavior is meaningful to another individual (adapted from Hollander, 1958).

9. Status represents an accumulation of the positively disposed impressions residing in the perceptions of relevant others.
10. Task competency is the perceived ability of a group member to perform activities which are focal to the group.
11. Variant behavior is a series of actions by an individual which is not conforming in all its aspects but which occurs within tolerable limits prescribed by a social system of which he is a member (Boles, 1969).

Operational Definitions

1. ACL is the Adjective Check List (Gough, Heilbrun, 1965).[1]
2. External status is interpreted in this study as a combination of status within the community and status within the discipline. External status comprised items eight and nine of Form R.
3. Form R is the instrument used in this study to gain cognizance of the perceptions held for the target nominees by their peers regarding task competency, external status, appearance and grooming, speaking ability, and idiosyncratic behavior.
4. High nominees are the five individuals within each division who received the greatest number of high nominations from their divisional peers.

---

[1] See Appendix A for the definitions of the scales and indices yielded by the Adjective Check List.

5. Idiosyncrasy credit is interpreted in this study as status and freedom to deviate. The term was used operationally in the Nomination Form.
6. Low nominees are the five individuals within each division who received the greatest number of low nominations from their divisional peers.
7. Nomination Form is the instrument used in this study to learn the names of the individuals perceived to have high status and freedom to deviate and the individuals perceived to have low status and freedom to deviate.
8. Target nominees are the high five and low five idiosyncrasy credit nominees.
9. Task competency is considered as a combination of knowledge of subject matter, teaching ability, relationship with students, contribution toward divisional objectives, and overal effectiveness as a faculty member. Task competency comprised items one, two, three, four, and seven of Form R.

Organization of the Dissertation

The purpose of Chapter I has been to state the problem, the significance of the study, the purpose of the study, the assumptions, the limitations, the definitions of terms, and the organization of the dissertation. Contained within Chapter II is the theory of idiosyncrasy credit and research on the theory. Chapter III, Design of the Study, contains an overview of the procedure, the hypotheses and questions explored, the sources of data, the methods of gathering data, the instrumentation, and the methods of analyzing data. Chapter IV contains a report of the findings, and Chapter V consists of a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and a statement of implications.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORY OF IDIOSYNCRASY CREDIT AND RELATED RESEARCH

This chapter consists of a review of Hollander's (1958) theory of idiosyncrasy credit and a summary of the designs and findings of those studies which are known to be related to the theory. A review of the theory is presented to inform the reader of its nature and a review of related research provides further substantiation of the necessity for this study.

The Theory of Idiosyncrasy Credit

The theory of idiosyncrasy credit (Hollander, 1958) is comprehensive in its treatment of conformity, status, and intragroup relationships. Theoretically, idiosyncrasy credit is an outcome of social interaction and represents an accumulation of positively disposed impressions residing in the perceptions of other members within the groups to which an individual belongs. Hollander asserted that social interaction between members within a group is essential for impressions to develop.

He contended that the idiosyncrasy credit model is applicable in small face-to-face groups or larger social entities such as organizations. The theory includes the notion that since an individual may have simultaneous membership in many groups, he may be considered to have a distinct credit balance in each group in which he interacts.

Hollander also hypothesized that each individual within a group may be thought of as having a degree of group-awarded credit that permits idiosyncratic behavior before group sanctions are applied. Hollander defined idiosyncratic behavior as behavior which may be perceived as deviant from a common expectancy. Thus, the possession of idiosyncrasy credit allows for idiosyncratic behavior of an individual before group sanctions are applied to him.

According to Hollander, idiosyncrasy credit represents status, which may allow for variant behavior, innovation, and the assertion of influence. From this, one may infer that an individual with a high amount of idiosyncrasy credit is in a good position to lead. Berg and Bass (1961) stated, with research support, that "the higher one's esteem, the more likely he is to succeed as a leader among those of lower esteem [p. 79]."

Hollander drew an analogy between the gain or loss of idiosyncrasy credit and a bank account with "credits" or "debits." An individual's credit balance may be added to or subtracted from depending upon the extremity and frequency of the manifested idiosyncratic behavior, and the credit level which the individual currently holds. As an example, Hollander stated that "in our society today, one's credit balance very likely will be rapidly exhausted by publicly espousing Communist doctrine." The theory includes the notion that if one exhausts his credit balance completely, pressures are applied to remove him from the group, or the group no longer perceives him to be a member.

A key point in Hollander's theory is the notion that an individual of high status and idiosyncrasy credit loses fewer credits for idiosyncratic behavior than does an individual with low status for similar behavior. However, research by Alvarez (1968) showed that such a relationship is tenable only in a successful[1] organization. Thus, in unsuccessful organizations, the higher-status incumbent loses credit at a much higher rate. The findings of the study by Alvarez are elaborated in a subsequent portion of this chapter.

According to Hollander there are three general variables which can be delineated as determinants of the impressions held by others which determine an individual's idiosyncrasy credit balance. The first of these variables is the perceived task competence of an individual; the second involves the characteristics of the individual; and the third is immediate past idiosyncratic behavior which constitutes a drain on credit. Hollander did not contend that credit is necessarily related linearly to these variables, nor did he ignore their likely interrelationships. He contended that the variables are intercorrelated through varying degrees of significance in generating or dissipating credits.

According to Hollander, however, mere possession by group members of positive impressions of an individual on the three aforementioned variables does not automatically accord him idiosyncrasy credit. Perceptual ability, representing a general alertness to the social stimulus field, is also an essential element in gaining a high credit balance.

---

[1] In the study conducted by Alvarez, degree of success was defined as the feedback offered the members of the hypothetical organization by the investigator. The investigator informed the members of the organizations on the performance of their organization on a continuum from very good to poor. If an organization obtained a very good rating it was termed successful; if it received a poor rating it was considered unsuccessful.

Associated with this concept is the view that conformity and nonconformity are not fixed to a single norm applicable to everyone. Rather, nonconforming behavior is variously defined by the group according to the idiosyncrasy credit balance of each individual. Consequently, individuals with a high idiosyncrasy credit balance have a wider latitude for nonconformity or idiosyncratic behavior in successful organizations. Thus, perceptual ability is essential in gaining and maintaining idiosyncrasy credit as a result of different and changing group expectancies. If an individual does not perceive the changing expectancies, he might think that he is exhibiting behavior which conforms with group expectations while, in fact, he is exhibiting idiosyncratic behavior and losing credits. Hollander accounted for the possibility that an individual may have poor skills in recognizing changing perceptions and termed it "perceptual error."

Hollander contended that, in addition to the perceptual variables, an individual's motivation to affiliate with a group in both social and focal activities is an element relating to an individual's idiosyncrasy credit balance. If an individual is lacking in motivation to belong to the group, it is unlikely that he would gain and maintain a high idiosyncrasy credit balance. Similarly, Hollander included the attraction that the group has for its members as an element affecting idiosyncrasy credit. If group members do not see their group as attractive, it will undoubtedly affect their motivational state. The final variable that Hollander associated with the idiosyncrasy credit model is the "communicality" (sic) of a given group expectancy. He maintained that the degree to which an expectancy is communicated is directly related to group attraction.

Research On the Theory

The first empirical research study on the idiosyncrasy credit model was conducted by Hollander (1960). In that study Hollander experimentally investigated the sequential relationship between perceived competency and nonconformity. He hypothesized in the experiment that given equivalent degrees of task competence, a group member should achieve greater acceptance of his influence when he has conformed in the past and then proceeds to nonconform than he should when another nonconformity precedes conformity.

To research the question four-person groups of college students were given a group choice task from a payoff matrix. The task required fifteen trials, but a confederate subject in each group was contrived to be correct on all but f[illegible] trials, thus reflecting considerable task competence. Postexperimental ratings were designed to assess the confederates' nonconforming influence on both task and nontask variables. Except when the confederates' nonconforming competence was displayed at the very beginning, the increasingly positive higher ratings of confederate subjects by the others supported the author's contention. Thus, early conformation to group expectancies and task competence allowed the confederate to gain in influence, whereas early nonconformity to agreed upon group procedures sharply reduced the influence of the group's most competent member. The results of Hollander's 1960 experiment coincided with the original idiosyncrasy credit model.

Inherent in the idiosyncrasy credit model is the thesis that one member of a group may perform certain actions with impunity whereas the same behavior exhibited by a different group member may elicit an opposite reaction. Hollander researched that central element of the idiosyncrasy credit model in 1961. In this experiment Hollander hypothesized that attributing higher degrees of competence to a person should result in a correspondingly greater willingness to accept that person's authority. Also, this effect should be enhanced for each degree of ascribed competence the longer the person is known to have belonged to the group. In a second element of the experiment Hollander contended that the status accorded a person should be inversely related to the disapproval of his deviancy. Or, the higher the status held by a person, the less would be the disapproval expressed by the group.

To conduct the experiment, student subjects were given a brief description of a person they were to imagine in any group to which they belonged. Eight descriptions were used. Half the subjects were told this stimulus person had "been in the group for a while," the other half that the person was "new to the group." Within each of these two categories the person was described as having one of four levels of competence. Subjects were then asked to signify on a seven-point scale how willing they would be to have this person in a position of authority. This was used as a measure of accorded status. The results indicated that both competence and length of time in the group contributed systematically to increased group awarded status. Hollander also conducted a second phase of the experiment wherein the scores for accorded status were looked at in relationship to how much the subjects would disapprove of various behaviors that the same stimulus person might show in the group. According to the author's prediction, the individuals with accorded high status were able to exhibit innovative behavior and incur less disapproval than their low status counterparts. In similar studies, Hollander's theory was researched by other investigators. A report of some such investigations follows.

Research on a high status person being allowed greater freedom to deviate from group norms had preceded Hollander's model. Lippitt, Polansky, Redl, and Rosen (1952), and Zander and Cohen (1955), asserted that the high status individual may show less conformity to the shared opinions of others in the group than does a low status person. Experiments by Dittes and Kelley (1956) and by Harvey and Consalvi (1960) also yielded results that are consistent with Hollander's theoretical model. In both cases, those people receiving the greatest acceptance from the other members exhibited lower conformity to group norms than did moderately accepted individuals. Harvey and Consalvi (1960) also found that an individual with a given status rank might not be willing to exhibit nonconforming behavior if his acceptance level was likely to change and the probability of this change was governed by other group members. Similarly, Julian and

Steiner (1961) found that high group acceptance was associated with low conformity in an experimental setting. Berkowitz and Macaulay (1961) also investigated a similar thesis and found that individuals of perceived higher status have a wider latitude for nonconformity than their lower status counterparts. In addition to the aforementioned studies the four studies which follow are related to portions of Hollander's idiosyncrasy credit model.

In an experimental setting, Sabath (1964) manipulated status and sequences of disruptive behavior. High-status individuals were presented as having special aptitude in an unfamiliar task. The research design included the use of a confederate who, unknown to the other group members as such, varied his competency in a standardized dowel-sorting task. To disrupt the task facilitation, the confederate dropped dowels on the floor and made annoying comments while the group was supposed to work rapidly. Status was induced primarily during a brief question-and-answer period which took place prior to the sorting task. To establish high status, the confederate reported high academic achievement, social recognition, and competency in sorting. To measure changes in perceived status questionnaire forms were filled out by the subjects in regard to the confederate. Each subject rated the disruptive confederate on qualities of competence, motivation, and various status attributes. Group members' perceptions of high-status individuals were generally favorable, regardless of their disruptive behavior. Thus, Sabath was able to conclude that in his short-term experimental study, high status makes one less accountable for his actions than does low status. Moreover, Sabath found that the ratings of high-status confederates were generally less subject to change than those recorded for low-status confederates.

Status and nonconformity were manipulated in a laboratory study with student subjects by Wiggins, Dill, and Schwartz (1965). Status was manipulated by the use of scores on a number of academic tests. The independent variable of nonconformity (in this case interference) was manipulated by the experimenter who fictitiously stated that a group member was cheating. The dependent variable of perceived status was measured by using an instrument which asked the subjects to rate other subjects on a variety of questions. The experiment confirmed the hypothesis that high status somewhat protects the individual from negative sanctions when he deviates. The researchers found, however, that the high status incumbents' freedom to nonconform is limited to nonconforming acts which do not interfere with the group achieving its goal. Also, the results showed that high status persons are punished less for minor, but more for major, interference than are middle status persons.

Alvarez (1968) also conducted an experimental study which researched deviance and reaction to deviance. In a tightly controlled 2x2x2 factorial design three variables which were hypothesized as determining deviance and the reaction to deviance were manipulated. The three variables manipulated included hierarchial status enjoyed by the presumed deviant within the group, imposition of sanctions upon the presumed deviant, and degree of success in accomplishing group goals. The study was conducted within work organizations simulated in a laboratory, and college students were used as subjects.

Findings showed that participants allocated more esteem to the deviant in a managerial position than to one in a worker position. This finding, however, is complicated by the question of whether or not the organization is successful in accomplishing its goals. Consequently, for the same or similar acts of deviance, the higher-status incumbent loses group awarded credits at a lower rate in successful organizations. Contrarily, in unsuccessful organizations the higher-status incumbent loses esteem at a much higher rate. Alvarez accounted for this finding by asserting that in unsuccessful[1] organizations it is the high-status members who may be held most accountable for system failure. Thus, the findings of Alvarez corroborate the hypotheses introduced by Hollander; Alvarez, however, introduced specifications for conditions to which these claims apply.

In a more recent study, Wahrman (1970) also researched the notion that higher status individuals may deviate from group expectations and incur less severe sanctions than their lower status counterparts. The findings of Wahrman do not concur with Hollander's theory and other research findings regarding idiosyncrasy credit. In his experimental study, using college students as subjects, Wahrman manipulated expectations at two levels. Wahrman induced general expectations by stating that the subjects had varying levels of education. Specific expectations were induced by stating the subject majors of the individuals. In the experiment the subjects discussed the case history of a delinquent. The case was written to emphasize the delinquent's need for warmth and understanding. Deviant behavior was induced in the experiment by a participant who recommended strict discipline for the delinquent. Wahrman found that the higher the general expectations, the more severe the sanctions and, similarly, the higher the specific expectations, the more the severe the sanctions. Wahrman explained his findings with the following statement:

---

[1] Organizations whose members were given negative feedback on their performance.

> If and when the group applies the level "deviant" to the non-conforming high status actor, penalties will reflect not only disapproval of the behavior itself, but also greater annoyance and disappointment with the source of the behavior for having violated these high expectations. Penalties are, therefore, more severe than they normally would be [p. 485].

The inconsistency between Wahrman's findings and other research can be explained in part by the variance among the operational definitions of nonconforming or deviant behavior. In the study conducted by Sabath (1964) nonconforming behavior consisted of dropping dowels in a dowel sorting task. Wiggins, Dill, and Schwartz (1965) manipulated nonconformity by using a confederate who fictitiously stated that a group member was cheating. Alvarez (1968) manipulated nonconformity by using confederates who exhibited varying degrees of task-relevant behavior. Wahrman introduced nonconforming behavior through the use of a confederate whose acts were inconsistent with his role. These varying operational definitions of nonconformity make comparison difficult. Therefore, the possibility exists that Wahrman's operational definition of nonconformity was so divergent from the definitions of nonconformity used in other studies that his results would be expected to be different.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to make the design of the study and the procedures used to implement it explicit. Specifically, the hypotheses and questions explored, the sources of the data, the methods of gathering data, the instrumentation, and the methods of analyzing data are explained.

Overview of Procedure

Participants in this study were selected from six academic divisions of three Michigan community colleges. Initially, all faculty members within each of the divisions were asked to participate in the study and comprised the sample. The instruments were administered in two phases. During the first phase of the study, a nomination form which asked faculty members to nominate their peers, was administered to determine the high five and low five idiosyncrasy credit holders. In the second phase of the study, three instruments were used to gather data on the characteristics of the high five and low five idiosyncrasy credit holders, which were termed the target nominees. The participating target nominees were asked to complete an instrument which assessed personality factors and a questionnaire which contained demographic and biographic items. The second phase of the study also required the participating faculty members in each division to rate the target nominees on the variables of task competency, appearance, speaking ability, external status, and idiosyncratic behavior.

Inferential statistical models were used to make comparisons between the high and low nominees for each of the variables studied. The data representing the personality variables and the variables of task competency, appearance, speaking ability, external status, and idiosyncratic behavior were analyzed through the use of $\underline{t}$ tests. The chi-square model was used to test the strength of a relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the sex of the nominees. The data regarding all demographic variables other than sex were analyzed through the use of the Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ test. Except where the $\underline{U}$ test was applied, the strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and each of the variables also was computed.

Hypotheses and Questions Explored

The main intent of this study was to investigate a selected number of individual variables in relation to idiosyncrasy credit. Six hypotheses and three questions, with a number of sub-questions, were explored. In instances where Hollander specifically provided a basis for hypothesis construction, hypotheses were constructed for this study. In instances where there was no basis for hypothesis construction, questions were asked.

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were investigated in this study.

1. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as being more competent in task related activities than the low nominees.
2. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as holding greater external status than the low nominees.
3. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as exhibiting a greater amount of idiosyncratic behavior than the low nominees.
4. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have been associated with the group for a longer period of time than the low nominees.
5. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have a greater need for intraception than the low nominees.
6. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have a greater need for affiliation than the low nominees.[1]

---

[1] Hollander (1958) hypothesized that idiosyncrasy credit was associated with the personality variables of motivation to belong and perception. To test that relationship, this study used the Adjective Check List (Gough, Heilbrun, 1965) to assess personality traits. This study used the ACL scale of need for affiliation as a measure of need to belong and the ACL scale of need for intraception as a measure of perception. Chapter three contains a description of the ACL and the methods used to administer it.

Questions

The following questions were investigated in this study.

1. What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and each of the following demographic variables?

   a. age
   b. academic degrees
   c. academic honors
   d. job related professional organizations
   e. published journal articles
   f. published books or monographs
   g. social, community, or church organizations
   h. offices held within social, community or church organizations
   i. committee participation
   j. sex

2. What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and each of the following personality variables?[1]

   a. total number of adjectives checked[2]
   b. number of favorable adjectives checked
   c. number of unfavorable adjectives checked
   d. lability
   e. personal adjustment
   f. self-control
   g. need for nurturance
   h. need for order
   i. need for autonomy
   j. need for aggression
   k. need for change
   l. need for succorance
   m. need for endurance
   n. need for dominance
   o. need for achievement
   p. need for heterosexuality

---

[1] Hollander (1958) did not speculate in regard to the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and personality traits other than motivation to belong and perception. Consequently, questions were asked regarding the personality traits and scales stated above.

[2] See Appendix A for definitions of the scales and indices yielded by the Adjective Check List.

q. need for abasement
r. need for deference
s. need for exhibition
t. self-confidence

3. What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and each of the following variables?

a. appearance and grooming
b. speaking ability

Sources of Data

Population

Because of an interest in the community college and a realization that few leadership studies had been conducted in the community college (Richardson, 1970) the investigator selected teaching faculty members from such institutions as the population. Therefore, the population was defined as all full-time faculty members within academic divisions of public, comprehensive, two-year, community colleges.

Criteria for Sample Selection

The sampling of subjects was controlled by the colleges and the academic divisions selected. This was necessary because the design stipulated that a subject must be a member of a division. The sample colleges were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The college must be public, two-year, comprehensive, and must serve a given community.
2. The college must contain at least two divisions of fifteen to thirty faculty members each.

3. The college must be located within 150 miles of the investigator, who lived in Flint, Michigan.
4. The college administration permits the investigator to conduct the study.

The sample divisions within each college were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The division chairman and the faculty members within the division must express a willingness to cooperate in the study.
2. There is an absence of major conflict among the faculty members within the division.
3. Each college utilized must have one social science division and one science and/or mathematics division, so that comparisons can be made between similar divisions in different colleges.

The sample subjects within each division were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Each subject must be a full-time teaching member without administrative assignment.
2. Each subject must not express opposition to the study.

A Description of the Sample

The total subjects involved in this study consisted of 140 faculty members within six academic divisions of three Michigan community colleges. To protect the anonymity of the subjects, the divisions, and the colleges, the actual names of the colleges and the subjects were not reported. Instead, the colleges were referred tc as Alpha, Beta, and Gamma. The divisions were termed by the nature of the subject matter taught and the subjects were referred to numerically.

College Alpha was located in a rural setting serving three urban areas. College Alpha was a comprehensive, public, community, two-year institution enrolling more than 5,000 students during the fall semester of 1970. At the time of the study, the college had been in existence on the same site for over ten years. Members of the Social Science division and the Science division were sampled. The Social Science division consisted of twenty-seven full-time faculty members while the Science division consisted of twenty-four full-time faculty members.

College Beta was located in a suburban area which serves a major metropolitan area. College Beta was a comprehensive, public, community, two-year institution enrolling more than 10,000 students in the fall of 1970. It was a multi-campus institution, of which the largest campus was utilized for this study. The campus on which this study was conducted had been in operation for over six years. Within college Beta, the Humanities division and the Science and Mathematics division were sampled. Although an attempt was made to select only Social Science and Math and Science divisions, the Humanities division was substituted in this case because the Social Science division consisted of thirty-eight faculty members, and was thus considered too large. The Humanities division consisted of twenty-two full-time faculty members while the Science and Mathematics division consisted of twenty-seven full-time faculty members.

College Gamma was located in a rural area which serves two urban areas. College Gamma was a comprehensive, public, community, two-year, institution enrolling more than 4,000 students in the fall of 1970. College Gamma had been operational for five years. The college was formerly housed in temporary facilities and had only recently occupied a new campus. Within college Gamma, the Social Science division and the Science and Mathematics division were sampled. Each division was comprised of twenty faculty members.

Methods of Gathering Data

The data were collected in two phases. The first phase consisted of the administration of the idiosyncrasy credit Nomination Form (see Appendix B), to select the target nominees. The second and subsequent phase consisted of the administration of three instruments by means of which data about the target nominees were gathered. The three instruments used were the Demographic Form, the Adjective Check List, and a peer rating form termed Form R.

In all three colleges sampled, the procedure for the administration of the instruments was identical. Initially, the researcher traveled to the colleges and personally asked the permission of a central adminstrative officer to conduct the research. Following an explanation of the nature of the study, each administrator who was questioned agreed to allow the study to be conducted. The central administrator questioned was a director of institutional research in each of two cases and an academic dean in the third, where personnel in institutional research did not exist. Next, the permission of each divisional chairman was sought, and in all cases verbal approval to conduct the study was granted.

To begin the first phase of data collection, a list of faculty names within each of the divisions was obtained. The list of names was transferred to the idiosyncrasy credit Nomination Form (see Appendix B). The researcher then proceeded to confer personally with each of the subjects on an individual basis. The nature of the study, the requirements of the participants, and the confidentiality of the data were explained to each of the subjects. An appropriate Nomination Form and a stamped, addressed envelope were given to each individual who consented to participate. One week after the Nomination Forms were distributed, a reminder note was sent to each participating subject (see Appendix B).

The data resulting from returned Nomination Forms were used to elect the target nominees. The total number of high nominations and the total number of low nominations received by each faculty member were tabulated. An algebraic score for each instructor was achieved by subtracting the smaller number from the larger. For example, if an individual received more high nominations than lows, the number of low nominations was subtracted from the number of high nominations, or if he received more lows than highs, the opposite procedure was followed to obtain the algebraic score. Using algebraic scores to partition high and low nominees, the ten target nominees were then designated as the five names in each division who achieved the highest number of high nominations plus the five names who received the highest number of low nominations. The nomination scores by subjects classified according to division and college are displayed in Appendix D.

Seventy per cent of all subjects returned the Nomination Form. Among the academic divisions, the percent of returns varied from a low of fifty-five per cent to a high of eighty per cent. The number and per cent of returns for the Nomination Form are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Number and Per Cent of Subject Responses for the Idiosyncrasy Credit Nomination Form

College	Division	Number of Instructors Within Division	Number of Completed Forms Returned	Per Cent of Forms Returned
Alpha	Social Science	27	20	73%
Alpha	Science	24	19	79%
Beta	Humanities	22	14	63%
Beta	Science and Mathematics	27	19	70%
Gamma	Social Science	20	11	55%
Gamma	Science and Mathematics	20	16	80%
	TOTAL	140	99	70%

To implement the second phase of the data collection, the researcher again returned to each campus to distribute the necessary instruments. Each faculty member in each sample division was given a packet containing copies of Form R (see Appendix B). The target subjects were not permitted to rate themselves so they were given nine copies each of Form R, one for each of the other target nominees in the division. All participating faculty members within each division, outside of the target nominees, were given ten copies of Form R, one for each of the ten target nominees. In addition to the copies of Form R, the target nominees were each given an Adjective Check List (see Appendix B) and a Demographic Information Form (see Appendix B) to fill out in regard to his own person. Each packet of forms also contained a letter describing the study and providing instructions. Two different letters were written, one for target nominees (see Appendix C) and another for instructors (see Appendix C) in the division who were not included in the target group. A separate letter was necessary for the target subjects because their packets contained the ACL and the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix D) which were not required of other subjects. Approximately one week after the instrument packets were distributed, a reminder notice was mailed. In a number of cases the researcher traveled to the campuses again and personally requested that the packets be returned. The numbers and per cent of completed second-phase instruments are displayed in Appendix E.

Among all colleges, fifty-eight per cent of all subjects returned the Form R packets. The per cent of returns within each of the divisions for the Form R packet varied from a low of thirty-one per cent to a high of eighty-five per cent. Regarding the returns on the Demographic Information Form, the total returns from all colleges was eighty-six per cent. Among divisions, the returns varied from a low of seventy per cent to a high of one hundred per cent. Regarding the Adjective Check List, from all colleges eighty-one per cent of the target nominees returned completed ACL's. Among individual divisions, the returns varied from a low of seventy per cent to a high of one hundred per cent.

Instrumentation

In this study, four instruments were used to obtain the required data. In the first phase of the study, the peer Nomination Form was administered and, in the second and subsequent phase, the Adjective Check List, the Demographic Information Form, and Form R were administered to the subjects.

Peer Nomination Form

The basic instrument on which this study was based was the idiosyncrasy credit Nomination Form (see Appendix A). The Nomination Form was constructed specifically for this study. The form explains, defines, and operationalizes idiosyncrasy credit in simplified terms. The Nomination Form stated the nature of this study, assured the confidentiality of the data, and provided instructions. Faculty members were asked to nominate from the list of faculty names within their division the five individuals whom they perceived as holding the greatest amount of status and the greatest freedom to deviate and the five individuals whom they perceived as holding the least amount of status and the least freedom to deviate. The combined terms of status and freedom to deviate were used in this study as an operational definition of idiosyncrasy credit for purposes of instrumentation.

The peer nomination technique offered a number of advantages over other methods of gathering data. The technique made it possible to involve a large number of raters to make the ratings more reliable. Also, the technique had the virtue of taking into account the reality of everyday life where those persons who are in continued close contact with each other are in a good position to observe each others' performance. Although the Nomination Form was constructed specifically for this study, the validity and reliability of the nomination technique had been established by several earlier studies, descriptions of some of which follow.

The first substantial work completed on the validity and reliability of the peer nomination technique was conducted by the Armed Forces. Williams and Leavitt (1947) utilized peer ratings of officer candidates to predict their performance in combat. Those investigators found that "sociometric group opinion was a more valid predictor both of success in Officer Candidate School and of combat performance than several objective tests and superiors' ratings [p. 29]." Wherry and Fryer (1949) found that peer nominations appeared to be a better measure of ability to lead than any other variable. Confirmation of these results also came from follow-up studies of graduates of West Point (1948, 1949).

In regard to computed values of validity for the peer nomination technique, Richardson, Bellows, and Henry (1951) found levels of .76 and .77; Webb (1956) obtained .90 value for pooled group ratings.

In regard to split-half reliability, Hollander (1954) found coefficients for peer nominations of leadership falling quite routinely between .85 and .90, while Anderhalter, et al. (1952) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of peer nominations at about .90. Hollander (1964) concluded as follows:

> The evidence supporting the validity and reliability of the peer ratings technique is consistent and substantial. Nominations do predict diverse behavioral phenomena reliably [p. 96].

Concern has been expressed over the possibility that peer nominations are contaminated through friendship bias. Hollander (1956) investigated that problem and found that overall the data revealed that about two out of five acknowledged friends named by each subject were nominated, on the average, as high nominees. Hollander reached the following conclusions:

> In broad terms, the results obtained do not support the contention that friendship operates as an adversely biasing and invalidating factor in peer nominations. It is true, of course, that friends do receive a somewhat larger number of 'high' nominations than their actual proportion would indicate. But the aggregative effect of this--in the popularity sense--does not lead to a generalized diminution of validity. Thus, though popularity tends to be functionally related to peer-nomination scores, this fails to alter prediction fundamentally [p. 136].

Adjective Check List

To provide information on the personalities of the subjects, the Adjective Check List (Gough, Heilbrun, 1965) was used (see Appendices A and B). The ACL consists of 300 adjectives commonly asked to describe the attributes of a person. The ACL yields information concerning twenty-four experimental scales and indices.

As a measure of reliability, Gough and Heilbrun (1965) twice administered the ACL to 100 men, with approximately six months between times. The test-retest mean reliability coefficient was calculated at .54 for the words. The test-retest mean reliability coefficient for the ACL scales was calculated at .50.

Heilbrun (1958) researched the validity of the ACL by correlating it with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954). Versions of the ACL need scales were related to their counterparts on the EPPS. The rank order of needs as assessed by the ACL correlated .60 with the ranking given by the EPPS.

In another validational study (Heilbrun, 1960) personality differences between maladjusted and adjusted college students as measured by the ACL need scales were compared with the combined judgments of psychologists as to what the personality correlates of adjustment for each subject should be. For male subjects, ten of the fifteen differences on the need scale were in the direction specified by the judges, whereas for the female group of subjects, five scales showed a significant difference in the appropriate direction.

In this study, use was made of twenty-two of the twenty-four scales yielded by the ACL. Two scales were not used because the Adjective Check List reports standardized scores on the basis of sex. In this study only the standardized male scale was used so that all scores would be comparable. Therefore all female scores in this study were converted to male scores. Changes in the value of the female scores when converted to male scores were significant in all but two of the ACL scales. Those two scales were defensiveness and counseling readiness. Therefore the two scales of defensiveness and counseling readiness were ignored and were not analyzed or reported in this study.

Demographic Information Form

To ascertain information on relevant demographic and biographic variables associated with idiosyncrasy credit, the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix B) was administered to the population sample. The Demographic Information Form was developed especially for this study. The fourteen items on the instrument originated from three sources: (1) inference from Hollander's model; (2) logic; and (3) a list of biographical factors adapted from a biographical questionnaire developed by Bass, Fiedler and Kruger (1964). The items included in the Demographic Information Form were as follows.

1. name
2. age
3. sex
4. marital status
5. seniority
6. tenure
7. college degrees
8. subject major
9. year earned
10. institution where earned
11. academic honors received
12. job related professional organizations
13. previous job titles
14. dates of previous employment
15. books or monographs published
16. published journal articles
17. social, community, and church organizations
18. offices held in social, community, and church organizations
19. committees participated in at the college

Form R

To assess the peer perceptions of the target subjects, Form R was developed (see Appendix B). Form R contains ten items with a scale of seven alternative responses from low to high for each item. Form R was developed from inference from Hollander's model, logic, and a teacher feedback instrument developed by Bryan (1958), and modified by Coats (1969) and Wolthuis (1970). The purpose of using Form R was to determine if the peer perceptions held for the high nominees were different from perceptions held for the low nominees. The ten items included in Form R were as follows.

1. knowledge of subject matter
2. teaching ability
3. relationship with students
4. contribution toward divisional objectives
5. speaking ability
6. appearance and grooming
7. overall effectiveness as a faculty member
8. status within the community
9. status within discipline outside the college
10. degree of nonconformity

The form provided instructions to the participants and gave a date and address for return to the investigator.

Methods of Analyzing Data

The methods of analyzing data were determined according to the hypotheses and questions developed and the data which were derived therefrom.

Data Analysis for the Hypotheses

The null form of the research hypotheses was tested by comparing, through the use of the one-tail t test, (Popham, 1967), differences between the mean scores of the high nominees and the low nominees. The comparisons were made within each division, college, and in total as the data permitted. The analysis of data at the divisional level was not possible for the hypotheses dealing with duration of affiliation, need for intraception, and need for affiliation because the sample size was not large enough.

A score for task competency consisted of a compilation of items one, two, three, four, and seven of Form R (see Appendix B). The data from items eight and nine of Form R were combined to yield the scores for the variable of external status. The recent idiosyncratic behavior score consisted of item ten of Form R. The source of the data for the hypotheses regarding need for affiliation and need for intraception[1] was the Adjective Check List (see Appendix B). Data regarding duration of affiliation were gathered through the use of item five of the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix B).

Data Analysis for the Questions

Three inferential statistical models were used to analyze the differences between the scores of the high nominees and the low nominees for each of the research questions. Namely, the three models used were the chi-square test, the Student's t test, and the Mann-Whitney U test. Data for each college and in total were analyzed statistically for each question. The data regarding speaking ability and appearance and grooming were also analyzed on a divisional basis. The data for other questions were not analyzed on a divisional basis because the sample sizes were too limited.

---

[1] See Appendix A for definitions of the terms need for affiliation and need for intraception.

The two-tail t test was used to analyze the data regarding appearance and grooming and speaking ability. Data which represented personality scales and indices were also analyzed through the use of the two-tail t test. Where the t test was used, the strength of association, ω^2, was also computed.

The Mann-Whitney U test (Siegel, 1956) was applied to all demographic variables other than sex. The U test was applied because it appeared as if the demographic data did not approach a normal distribution in the population.

For the variable of sex, the chi-square test (Siegel, 1956) was used to analyze the data. In computing the chi-square statistic, Yates' (1934) correction for continuity was employed. The coefficient of contingency, C, (Siegel, 1956) was used to compute the extent of association between idiosyncrasy credit and sex.

The source of the data regarding demographic variables was the Demographic Information Form. The Adjective Check List was the source of the data regarding personality variables. The source of the data regarding speaking ability was item five of Form R and the source of the data regarding appearance and grooming was item six of Form R. The instruments used in this study are presented in Appendix B.

Analysis of Instrumentation

The Form R instrument, which sought assessment of the perceptions of the target nominees' peers, was developed for this study. To determine independence or construct validity of the items on Form R, a factor analysis was computed (Kerlinger, 1964). From a factor analysis one is able to discern which variables on the instrument are intercorrelated.

Statistical Significance and Strength of Association

Traditionally, investigators have stated the specific level of statistical significance at which the null hypothesis would be rejected. A recent trend, however, has developed in behavioral science research to analyze results and merely report the level at which the null hypothesis can be rejected. This trend has arisen, in part, from the realization that the .05 and .01 levels of significance have little logical or scientific basis (Winer, 1962).

Because the statistical significance of an association between two variables is related to the size of the sample, it is meaningful to examine the strength of an association as well as the level of confidence. Additionally, a $\underline{t}$ test of the difference between two means merely informs the investigator that there was a relation (Kerlinger, 1964). If one is interested in knowing the degree of relationship it then becomes important to calculate the strength of association. According to Hays (1963), a better decision may be made about data by using both the level of statistical significance and the estimated strength of association than by considering level of significance alone.

In this study, an estimate of the strength of association, ω^2 (Kerlinger, 1964), was computed and reported for each comparison where parametric statistics were used. Through the calculation of ω^2, one is able to estimate the percentage of variance accounted for. The statistic ω^2 was not computed in regard to the variable of sex where the coefficient of contingency, $\underline{C}$, was used to compute the extent of association. In instances where the Fisher Exact Probability test and the Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ test were computed the strength of association was not computed because it would have been artificial to have done so.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

The data obtained from the procedures and analyses described in Chapter III are presented as follows. First, the analysis of the instrumentation is presented; second, the analysis of the data regarding the hypotheses is displayed, and finally the data analysis for the questions is exhibited.

The results of data analyses are presented in summary form for both the hypotheses and for the questions regarding demographic items within the text. The results of the analyses regarding personality variables are reported in the text only where significant associations were found. The results of all data analyses are displayed in their entirety in the Appendices.

The summary tables of each pair-wise comparison where the $\underline{t}$ test was used include the degrees of freedom, df; the mean score of the high nominees, mean high; the mean score of the low nominees, mean low; the computed $\underline{t}$ value, $\underline{t}$; the level of statistical significance, $\underline{p}$; and the strength of association, ω^2. The summary tables where the Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ test was applied include the total number of subjects, N; the mean score of the high nominees, mean high; the mean score of the low nominees, mean low; the computed $\underline{U}$ value, $\underline{U}$; the computed $\underline{Z}$ value, $\underline{Z}$; and the level of statistical significance, $\underline{p}$. Where chi-square was used the raw frequencies were reported, the computed chi-square,

$\underline{x}^2$; the degrees of freedom, df; the level of statistical significance, p; and the coefficient of contingency, C.

For all statistical versions of the research hypotheses, one-tail t tests were computed. For all research questions the level of significance was based on the two-tail distribution. Probability levels are reported at the approximate obtained significance probability or as n.s. (not significant) if the probability level of observing tested differences due to error variance is greater than .50.

Analysis of Instrumentation

Factor Analysis of Form R

To determine the underlying factors of Form R, an inter-correlation matrix, factor matrix, and a rotated factor matrix were computed. The inter-correlation and factor matrices are displayed in Appendix F. Tables 38 and 39. Contained within Table 2 is the rotated factor matrix.

TABLE 2

Rotated Factor Matrix of Form R

	Form R Item	I	II	III
1.	KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER	.729	-.004	-.226
2.	TEACHING ABILITY	.876	.009	-.166
3.	RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS	.821	.035	-.053
4.	CONTRIBUTION TOWARD DIVISIONAL OBJECTIVES	.775	-.036	-.214
5.	SPEAKING ABILITY	.714	-.090	-.223
6.	APPEARANCE AND GROOMING	.256	-.684	-.262
7.	OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS AS A FACULTY MEMBER	.810	-.100	-.249
8.	STATUS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY	.226	-.02	-.853
9.	STATUS WITHIN DISCIPLINE OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE	.240	.010	-.840
10.	DEGREE OF NONCONFORMITY	.146	.80	-.195

An inspection of the rotated factor matrix indicated that there were three distinct factors operating within the ten Form R items, namely task competency, external status and nonconformity. For the most part, the three factors found were consistent with the use made of Form R data.

An examination of the rotated factor matrix revealed that items one, two, three, four, five, and seven are strongly associated with a common factor. This study used a combination of items one, two, three, four, and seven as a measure of task competency. The factor analysis seemed to indicate that speaking ability (item five) was related to task competency.

The degree of nonconformity and appearance and grooming were analyzed on separate bases. An examination of the rotated factor matrix disclosed that these two items appear to be somewhat distinct from other items and from each other.

The variable of external status was operationalized as a combination of items eight and nine as found on Form R. An inspection of the rotated factor matrix showed that both items were highly correlated with each other and together were distinct from other factors.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as being more competent in task related activities than the low nominees.

Presented within Table 3 is a summary of the results of the one-tail t tests used to determine the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency. The analyzed data are displayed in their entirety in Appendix F, Table 40. Task competency was measured by ratings of faculty members on items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 of Form R.

TABLE 3

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Perceived Task Competency

	df	Mean High[a]	Mean Low[b]	t	p[c]	ω^2
College Alpha	1178	5.65	4.24	19.41	.0005	.24
Social Science Division	678	5.56	4.28	14.82	.0005	.24
Science Division	498	5.80	4.19	12.77	.0005	.24
College Beta	858	5.81	4.23	15.78	.0005	.22
Humanities Division	278	5.50	3.76	8.29	.0005	.19
Science Division	578	5.94	4.51	13.51	.0005	.23
College Gamma	1083	5.73	4.26	19.50	.0005	.26
Social Science Division	488	5.61	4.37	10.69	.0005	.18
Science Division	593	5.83	4.16	16.84	.0005	.33
Total	3123	5.66	4.31	28.01	.0005	.20

[a] Mean high = Mean task competency score for the high idiosyncrasy credit nominees.

[b] Mean low = Mean task competency score for the low idiosyncrasy credit nominees.

[c] p = One-tail test of significance.

The results of the analyses indicate quite clearly that the high idiosyncrasy credit nominees were perceived to be more competent in task related activities than were the low nominees. This relationship was found within all divisions, colleges, and in total. These differences could have been expected by chance only five times in ten thousand. The average, ω^2, for all divisions combined was twenty percent.

Hypothesis 2. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as holding greater external status than the low nominees.

Table 4 contains a summary of the results of the one-tail t tests used to compute the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and external status. Displayed within Appendix F, Table 40, is a comprehensive table of all the analyzed data. External status was measured by a combination of ratings on items eight and nine of Form R.

TABLE 4

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Perceived External Status

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	448	5.01	3.19	13.70	.0005	.29
Social Science Division	256	4.93	3.16	10.69	.0005	.30
Science Division	190	5.13	3.21	8.70	.0005	.28
College Beta	238	5.07	3.74	7.16	.0005	.18
Humanities Division	90	4.92	3.76	3.39	.0005	.10
Science Division	146	5.14	3.72	6.59	.0005	.21
College Gamma	248	4.96	3.86	5.46	.0005	.10
Social Science Division	130	4.74	4.06	2.63	.0005	.04
Science Division	116	5.22	3.65	5.07	.0005	.17
Total	938	5.01	3.50	15.62	.0005	.20

[a] One-tail test of significance

From an examination of the results, it is evident that the high nominees were perceived as holding greater external status than the low nominees. This relationship was demonstrated in all divisions, colleges and in total. These differences could have been expected by chance only five times in ten thousand. The strength of association, ω^2, indicated that external status accounted for a low of four percent of the variance in idiosyncrasy credit ratings in one division to a high of thirty percent in another. The average ω^2, computed on all of the data, accounted for twenty percent of the variance in idiosyncrasy credit ratings.

Hypothesis 3. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will be perceived as exhibiting a greater amount of idiosyncratic behavior than the low nominees.

Exhibited within Table 5 is a summary of the findings of the t tests used to test the existence of a relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior. Displayed within Appendix F, Table 40, are the data in their entirety. The idiosyncratic behavior score came from item ten of Form R.

TABLE 5

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Idiosyncratic Behavior

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	258	3.93	2.82	5.41	.0005	.09
Social Science Division	153	3.81	2.76	3.89	.0005	.07
Science Division	103	4.11	2.95	3.55	.0005	.09
College Beta	187	2.89	2.53	1.29	.10	.00
Humanities Division	61	5.40	2.06	8.58	.0005	.53
Science Division	124	1.82	2.78	4.02	.0005	.10
College Gamma	225	3.70	3.19	2.55	.01	.02
Social Science Division	98	3.70	3.15	1.62	.10	.01
Science Division	125	3.69	3.21	1.89	.025	.02
Total	674	3.27	3.14	.83	.25	.00

[a] One-tail test of significance

The results are mixed in both direction and strength of association. The high nominees were perceived to exhibit greater idiosyncratic behavior at a level of significance beyond .02 in each of four divisions. Among those four divisions the portion of the variance accounted for, ω^2, ranged between one percent and fifty-three percent. In one division the direction of the data was reversed and in another the difference was slight. When all data were combined, the differences were found to be slight and the portion of the variance accounted for was zero.

Hypothesis 4. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have held group membership for a longer time than the low nominees.

Table 6 offers a summary of the results of the one-tail t tests used to test the existence of a relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and duration of affiliation. The analyzed data are displayed in their entirety in Appendix F, Table 42. Item five of the Demographic Information Form was the source of the duration of group affiliation data.

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Duration of Group Affiliation

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	18	4.80	3.90	.75	.25	.00
College Beta	14	6.00	6.62	.53	.40	.00
College Gamma	13	3.87	3.14	1.21	.25	.03
Totals	49	4.88	4.26	1.09	.25	.00

[a] One-tail test of significance

An examination of these analyses reveals that in two of three colleges the high nominees had belonged to the group for a greater length of time than the low nominees. In both of these instances a difference this great could be expected by chance twenty-five times in one hundred. The portion of the variance accounted for was zero in two colleges while in College Gamma three percent of the variance was accounted for.

Hypothesis 5. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have a greater need for intraception than the low nominees.

Contained within Table 7 is a summary of the results of the t tests used to determine the relationship need for intraception and idiosyncrasy credit. A complete display of the analyzed data is exhibited in Appendix F, Table 42. The need for intraception scores were yielded by the Adjective Check List.

TABLE 7

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Intraception

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p	ω^2
College Alpha	17	55.11	59.10	.80	.50[b]	.00
College Beta	12	49.83	56.50	1.00	.50[b]	.00
College Gamma	13	55.62	54.57	.17	ns[a]	.00
Totals	46	53.91	57.00	.95	.50[b]	.00

[a] One-tail test of significance

[b] Two-tail test of significance

The results suggest that the high nominees do not have a greater need for intraception than the low nominees. In fact, in two of three colleges the data indicate the opposite. No significant differences were found in any of the analyses.

Hypothesis 6. The faculty members who are identified as high idiosyncrasy credit nominees will have a greater need for affiliation than the low nominees.

Table 8 contains a summary of the results of the t tests used to determine the relationship between need for affiliation and idiosyncrasy credit. Appendix F, Table 42, contains a complete display of the analyzed data. The Adjective Check List was the source of the need for affiliation scores.

TABLE 8

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Affiliation

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p	ω^2
College Alpha	17	55.22	49.20	.72	.25[a]	.00
College Beta	12	50.66	53.25	.50	ns[b]	.00
College Gamma	13	45.62	45.28	.06	ns[a]	.00
Totals	46	49.52	49.40	.04	ns[a]	.00

[a] One-tail test of significance

[b] Two-tail test of significance

An examination of the results suggests that there were no significant differences between the high and low nominees in regard to need for affiliation.

Research Questions

The analyzed data are presented in the text in summary form for each demographic variable. Because twenty-one personality variables were investigated, only those variables showing a relationship with idiosyncrasy credit are presented here. The results of all data analyses are shown, in total, in Appendix F. The source of the demographic data was the Demographic Information Form, and the source of the personality data was the Adjective Check List. The instruments used in this study are displayed in Appendix B.

Questions regarding demographic variables

Question 1a: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and age?

An examination of the data analyses revealed that there were no strong relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and age. Table 9 contains the results of the data analyses regarding age.

TABLE 9

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Age

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p[a]	ω^2
College Alpha	18	39.70	35.80	.85	.50	.00
College Beta	14	34.62	39.62	1.36	.20	.05
College Gamma	13	40.87	35.71	1.15	.50	.02
Totals	49	38.50	37.00	.60	ns	.00

[a] Two-tail test of significance

Question 1b: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of earned college degrees?

In preparing the data for analysis, each Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, and Doctor's degree was counted as one. Table 10 contains the results of the statistical analyses regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and earned college degrees.

TABLE 10

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Earned College Degrees

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p^a
College Alpha	20	2.30	2.10	35.00	1.13	.24
College Beta	16	2.28	2.12	23.50	.52	.44
College Gamma	16	2.25	1.85	18.00	1.15	.16
Total	50	2.28	2.00	228.50	1.63	.10

[a] Two-tail test of significance

From an examination of the results, it was apparent that the high nominees earned more college degrees than the low nominees. This tendency was noted in all three colleges and in total. The levels of computed statistical significance, however, were weak. When the data from all three colleges were combined and analyzed, a difference was found that could have been expected by chance ten times in one hundred.

Question 1c: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of academic honors?

The results of the Mann-Whitney U Tests regarding the academic honors data are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Academic Honors

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	.80	1.60	36.00	-1.05	.28
College Beta	16	.62	.50	31.50	.05	ns
College Gamma	16	.87	.28	23.50	.52	.44
Total	52	.76	.88	309.00	-.30	ns

[a] Two-tail test of significance

The results of these analyses suggested that there were no significant differences between the number of academic honors of the high nominees and the low nominees.

Question 1d: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of memberships held in job-related professional organizations?

Table 12 offers a summary of the results of the U tests used to determine the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of memberships held in job-related professional organizations.

TABLE 12

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership in Professional Organizations

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	3.20	3.00	45.50	.34	ns
College Beta	16	1.62	3.25	13.00	1.99	.05
College Gamma	16	2.87	1.83	15.00	1.16	.08
Total	52	2.61	2.79	299.50	-.24	ns

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An inspection of the findings indicated that in two of three colleges the high nominees held more memberships in professional organizations than did the low nominees. In College Beta the low nominees held more memberships than the high nominees. When all data were combined, the differences found did not approach a strong level of significance.

Question 1e: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published journal articles?

Table 13 contains the results of the U tests to determine the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published journal articles.

TABLE 13

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Published Journal Articles

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	1.22	.10	22.50	1.83	.10
College Beta	16	1.25	1.00	28.00	.42	.32
College Gamma	16	2.75	.14	10.50	2.02	.02
Total	52	1.72	.36	200.50	2.17	.03

[a] Two-tail test of significance

These analyses indicated that the high nominees wrote and published more journal articles than did the low nominees. In College Alpha, the differences observed could have happened by chance ten times in one hundred. In College Beta, the differences observed could have been expected by chance thirty-two times out of one hundred. The difference found in College Gamma could have been observed by chance two times in one hundred. When the data were summarized the extent of the differences was clearly apparent. In total, the differences observed were statistically significant at the .03 level.

Question 1f: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published books or monographs?

The analyses regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and published books or monographs are reported in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Number of Published Books or Monographs

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	1.00	.10	34.50	1.17	.24
College Beta	16	.12	.37	24.00	-.84	.44
College Gamma	16	.25	.14	25.00	.34	.50
Total	52	.46	.20	302.50	.42	ns

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An examination of the results revealed that no strong relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published books or monographs.

Question 1g: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and membership in social, community, or church organizations?

From an examination of these analyses it was apparent that there was no consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and membership in social, community, or church organizations. The results of the statistical tests regarding membership are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership in Social, Community, or Church Organizations

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p^a
College Alpha	20	2.40	1.50	36.50	1.02	.30
College Beta	16	.50	1.00	21.00	-1.15	.26
College Gamma	16	1.37	.57	16.00	1.38	.10
Total	52	1.50	1.08	360.50	.66	.50

[a] Two-tail test of significance

Question 1h: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the holding of an office within social, community, or church organizations?

The results of these analyses are presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and the Holding of an Office Within Social, Community, or Church Organizations

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	1.40	1.00	44.50	.41	ns
College Beta	16	.25	.62	27.00	-.52	ns
College Gamma	16	.37	1.37	17.50	1.52	.16
Total	52	1.03	.69	294.00	.80	.42

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An examination of these analyses suggested that there was no consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the holding of an office within social, community, or church organizations.

Question li: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and membership on college committees?

The analyzed data are presented in Table 17. In Colleges Beta and Gamma the low nominees held more memberships than the high nominees. In College Beta the difference observed could have happened by chance twenty-six times out of one hundred and in College Gamma the differences could have occurred by chance ten times out of one hundred.

TABLE 17

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Membership on College Committees

	N	Mean High	Mean Low	U	Z	p[a]
College Alpha	20	2.40	1.20	20.50	1.02	.30
College Beta	16	1.00	1.62	21.00	-1.15	.26
College Gamma	16	.50	.71	16.00	-1.38	.10
Total	52	1.38	1.20	296.50	.53	.59

[a] Two-tail test of significance

Question 1j: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the sex of the group members?

The data for all colleges combined and the results of the analyses regarding such data are presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and the Sex of the Nominee for All Colleges Combined

	Male	Female	Total
Number of High Nominees	28	2	30
Number of Low Nominees	21	9	30
Total	49	11	60
x^2	df	p^a	C
3.98	1	.10	.06

[a] Two-tail test of significance

When the data were analyzed by college, no significant differences were found in regard to sex. When all data were combined, however, the results indicated a significant difference between the high and low nominees in regard to sex. This difference could have been expected by chance ten times in one hundred. The extent of association, C, was .06.

Questions regarding personality variables

Question 2: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and each of the following personality variables?

a. total number of adjectives checked
b. number of favorable adjectives checked

c. number of unfavorable adjectives checked
d. self-confidence
e. self-control
f. lability
g. personal adjustment
h. need for achievement
i. need for dominance
j. need for endurance
k. need for order
l. need for nurturance
m. need for heterosexuality
n. need for exhibition
o. need for autonomy
p. need for aggression
q. need for change
r. need for succorance
s. need for abasement
t. need for deference

Tables 19 through 26 present the results of the two-tailed _t_ tests which approached a level of significance. Appendix F, Table 42, displays the analyzed data regarding personality variables in their entirety. Only those personality variables which seemed to be associated with idiosyncrasy credit are presented in the text.

An inspection of the findings (see Appendix F, Table 42) reveals that no strong relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and any of the following personality scales and indices:

1. total number of adjectives checked
2. number of favorable adjectives checked
3. number of unfavorable adjectives checked
4. lability
5. personal adjustment
6. need for endurance
7. need for order
8. need for nurturance
9. need for autonomy
10. need for aggression
11. need for change
12. need for succorance

Definitions of the personality scales and indices used are presented in Appendix A.

Contained within Table 19 are the results of the analysis of the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the scale of self-confidence.

TABLE 19

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Self-Confidence

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	57.22	50.50	1.16	.40	.01
College Beta	12	56.20	56.12	.02	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	56.00	43.00	1.94	.10	.16
Total	46	56.47	50.20	1.76	.10	.04

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An examination of the results of this analysis indicated a slight tendency for the high nominees to score higher than the low nominees on the self-confidence scale. This tendency was found to exist in all three colleges and in total. However, in College Beta the differences were almost non-existent and in College Alpha the difference could have occurred by chance forty times out of one hundred. The highest level of statistical significance occurred in College Gamma and in total when the differences could have occurred by chance ten times in one hundred. The strength of association, ω^2, indicated that, in total, self-confidence accounted for four percent of the variance.

The results of the data analysis regarding need for dominance are reported in summary form in Table 20.

TABLE 20

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Need for Dominance

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	59.22	52.00	1.55	.20	.07
College Beta	12	54.33	59.37	.81	.50	.00
College Gamma	13	59.25	44.28	2.48	.05	.25
Total	46	57.95	52.20	1.73	.10	.04

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An examination of the results revealed that in two of three colleges the high nominees exhibited a greater need for dominance than did the low nominees. In College Alpha a difference this great could have occurred by chance twenty times in one hundred and in College Gamma the difference could have occurred by chance five times in one hundred. In College Beta the direction of the data was reversed and the difference was not large enough to approach a high level of significance. When all data were combined a difference this large could have occurred by chance ten times in one hundred. The strength of association, ω^2, revealed that need for dominance accounted for four percent of the variance.

Displayed within Table 21 is a summary of the data regarding the need for achievement scale.

TABLE 21

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Achievement

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	62.22	53.90	1.80	.10	.10
College Beta	12	56.00	62.37	1.25	.50	.04
College Gamma	13	57.12	48.00	1.72	.12	.11
Total	46	58.82	54.96	1.27	.50	.01

[a] Two-tail test of significance

An inspection of the results revealed that in two of three colleges the high nominees scored higher than the low nominees. Differences that large could have occurred by chance in College Alpha ten times in one hundred and in College Gamma twelve times in one hundred. In College Beta the direction of the data was reversed. However, the difference found was not large enough to reach a high level of significance.

Displayed within Table 22 is a summary of the data regarding the need for heterosexuality scale.

TABLE 22

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Need for Heterosexuality

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	54.66	40.90	2.30	.05	.18
College Beta	12	53.50	50.62	.38	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	47.25	49.28	.47	ns	.00
Total	46	51.78	46.36	1.53	.20	.02

[a] Two-tail test of significance

In College Alpha and College Beta the high nominees achieved higher mean scores than the low nominees in regard to need for heterosexuality. In College Alpha the difference could have occurred by chance only five times in one hundred. The differences in the other two colleges and in total were not large enough to reach a high level of significance.

A brief display of the analyzed data regarding need for aggression is contained in Table 23.

TABLE 23

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Need for Aggression

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	51.55	48.30	.70	.50	.00
College Beta	12	51.50	50.37	.16	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	56.75	46.00	1.64	.20	.10
Total	46	53.34	48.32	1.53	.20	.02

[a] Two-tail test of significance

In all three colleges and in total a tendency for the high nominees to score higher on the need for aggression scale was noted. In two colleges, however, a high level of significance was not reached. In College Gamma and in total the differences could have occurred by chance twenty times in one hundred.

Table 24 contains a summary of the data analysis regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and need for abasement.

TABLE 24

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Need for Abasement

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	43.55	49.40	1.47	.20	.05
College Beta	12	44.66	45.12	.08	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	44.00	50.57	1.24	.50	.03
Total	46	44.00	48.56	1.63	.15	.03

[a] Two-tail test of significance

In all three colleges and in total a tendency for the low nominees to score higher than the high nominees in need for abasement was noted. In College Alpha a difference this large could have occurred by chance twenty times in one hundred. When all data were combined the difference could have occurred by chance fifteen times in one hundred. In both College Beta and College Gamma the differences found were consistent in direction but failed to reach a high level of significance.

A brief display of the analyzed data regarding need for deference is contained in Table 25.

TABLE 25

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Need for Deference

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	47.00	50.10	.54	ns	.00
College Beta	12	48.00	48.62	.09	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	42.12	53.28	1.62	.15	.10
Total	46	45.56	50.52	1.39	.20	.01

[a] Two-tail test of significance

In all three colleges and in total the low nominees exhibited higher mean scores than the high nominees in regard to need for deference. However, in College Alpha and College Beta the differences were minimal. In College Gamma the difference between the high and low nominees could have occurred by chance fifteen times in one hundred.

A summary of the results of the two-tail t analysis regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and need for exhibition is presented in Table 26.

TABLE 26

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit
and Need for Exhibition

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	17	52.11	46.30	1.09	.50	.01
College Beta	12	53.66	50.87	.46	ns	.00
College Gamma	13	55.00	44.14	1.60	.20	.09
Total	46	53.52	47.16	1.90	.10	.05

[a] Two-tail test of significance

The faculty members who were identified as high nominees exhibited a greater need for exhibition than the low nominees. This tendency was noted in each division. The differences, however, were not large enough to reach a high level of statistical significance.

Question 3: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming?

Table 27 contains a summary of the results of the two-tail t tests used to compute the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming. The sample size was large enough, in this instance, to allow for analyses within each division as well as each college and in total. Appendix F, Table 40 displays all of the analyzed data regarding appearance and grooming.

TABLE 27

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Appearance and Grooming

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	253	5.41	4.91	2.94	.01	.02
Social Science Division	150	5.36	5.25	.46	ns	.00
Science Division	101	5.51	4.46	4.63	.001	.16
College Beta	195	5.09	5.22	.69	.50	.00
Humanities Division	60	3.93	5.18	3.10	.01	.12
Science Division	133	5.56	5.25	1.62	.20	.00
College Gamma	250	5.56	5.30	1.72	.10	.00
Social Science Division	101	5.50	5.32	.68	.50	.00
Science Division	145	5.60	5.28	1.81	.10	.01
Total	701	5.36	5.13	2.26	.05	.00

[a] Two-tail test of significance

The relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming varied considerably from one division to another. In five of the six divisions the high nominees obtained higher ratings than the low nominees. A strong relationship was found, however, only in the Science Division of College Alpha where the difference could have occurred by chance one time in one thousand. An inspection of the findings revealed that in the Humanities Division of College Beta the low nominees scored higher than the high nominees. Such a difference could have occurred by chance one time in one hundred.

Question 4: What is the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and speaking ability?

A summary of the results of the two-tail t analyses regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and speaking ability is presented in Table 28. A complete presentation of the findings is displayed in Appendix F, Table 40.

TABLE 28

Relationship Between Idiosyncrasy Credit and Speaking Ability

	df	Mean High	Mean Low	t	p^a	ω^2
College Alpha	254	5.71	4.17	10.25	.001	.29
Social Science Division	148	5.72	4.19	8.41	.001	.32
Science Division	104	5.68	4.15	5.97	.001	.24
College Beta	197	5.35	4.37	4.73	.001	.10
Humanities Division	60	5.37	3.69	4.29	.001	.21
Science Division	135	5.34	4.72	2.66	.001	.04
College Gamma	240	5.70	4.53	7.16	.001	.18
Social Science Division	102	5.67	4.81	3.18	.001	.07
Science Division	136	5.72	4.33	6.96	.001	.25
Total	695	5.60	4.35	12.64	.001	.18

[a] Two-tail test of significance

The high nominees achieved higher mean scores than the low nominees in all instances. Differences as large as those found could have occurred by chance one time in one thousand. The strength of association, ω^2, ranged from a low of four percent to a high of thirty-two percent. When the data were analyzed in total the strength of association was calculated at eighteen percent.

Summary

A strong positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency. A strong positive relationship was also found between idiosyncrasy credit and external status.

A consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and duration of group affiliation was not evident. An inspection of the results also indicated that there was no consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the hypothesized variables of need for affiliation and need for intraception.

Conflicting relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior. A considerable amount of variance in the computed strength of association was noted from one division to another.

Evidence of a consistent positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and age was not found. A tendency of the high nominees to hold more college degrees than the low nominees was noted.

A consistent relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of academic honors or memberships held in professional organizations was not evident. A positive relationship was found to exist between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published journal articles. Evidence of a strong relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published books or monographs, or number of memberships held in college committees, was not found. The results also indicated that females received a greater proportion of low nominations than did males.

No consistent relationships were determined to exist between idiosyncrasy credit and the following personality scales: total number of adjectives checked, number of favorable adjectives checked, number of unfavorable adjectives checked, lability, personal adjustment, need for endurance, need for order, need for nurturance, need for autonomy, need for aggression, need for change, and need for succorance.

Although high levels of statistical significance were not reached, the data indicated a tendency for the following variables to be positively associated with idiosyncrasy credit: self-confidence, need for dominance, need for exhibition, need for achievement, need for heterosexuality, and need for agression. A tendency for a negative association with idiosyncrasy credit was found regarding need for abasement and need for deference.

The relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming was inconsistent from one situation to another. A strong positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and speaking ability. It must be noted, however, that the results of a factor analysis indicated that the scores which comprised speaking ability were high intercorrelated with the scores which constituted task competency.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will (1) provide the reader with a brief description of the purposes and design of the study, (2) discuss the findings in regard to the idiosyncrasy credit theory, (3) present the conclusions drawn from the findings, and (4) offer a brief discussion of the implications of the findings.

Summary

In attempting to understand the behavior of individuals within groups, observers have been perplexed by the differences in behavioral limits accorded group members. Moreover, leaders have expressed concern that in a group setting, certain prestigious individuals can exhibit behavior that would bring prompt and punitive sanctions upon lesser individuals. A comprehensive theory, termed "idiosyncrasy credit," was developed by Hollander (1958) which attempted to explain such a behavioral phenomenon.

Hollander's theory and model of idiosyncrasy credit are comprehensive in their treatment of conformity and status. Idiosyncrasy credit may be considered as the positive impressions of a person held by others. Credit represents status and allows for behavior which may be variant, innovative, or influential in nature. According to Hollander, idiosyncrasy credit is supposed to be measured by the degree to which an individual may exceed the "limits" set by the common expectancies of the group.

Portions of Hollander's theory have not been validated by empirical study. Hollander hypothesized that the three general variables which are determinants of idiosyncrasy credit are: (1) task competency, (2) individual characteristics, and (3) immediate past idiosyncratic behavior. The variables of task competency and immediate past idiosyncratic behavior have been previously investigated in laboratory studies, but were lacking verification of their association with idiosyncrasy credit in a field situation. Also, only a few specific individual characteristics which are associated with idiosyncrasy credit have been investigated in any setting, so far as was known. It was suggested by Boles (1970) that the theory of idiosyncrasy credit may provide educators with a framework for studying behavior within the various social systems found in education. So far as was known, the theory of idiosyncrasy credit had not been previously investigated in an educational setting.

Therefore, the intent of this study was to investigate a portion of the theory of idiosyncrasy credit outside of the laboratory in an educational field setting. Also, this study sought to learn if the portion of the idiosyncratic credit theory which it investigated was a mere hypothetical construct or was congruent with real social systems in education.

The specific purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency, external status, recent idiosyncratic behavior, duration of group affiliation, appearance and grooming, speaking ability, and selected personality and demographic variables in various collegical situations.

The sample from the population represented in this study consisted of 140 faculty members within six academic divisions of three Michigan community colleges. This study was designed to make comparisons between faculty members with a high amount of idiosyncrasy credit and faculty members with a low amount of idiosyncrasy credit within each academic division. The faculty members with high idiosyncrasy credit and the faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit were determined through the development and administration of a peer nomination form. The nomination form asked faculty members to nominate, from a list of faculty names in their division, the names of the five persons that they considered to have the highest amount of idiosyncrasy credit and the five with the lowest amount of idiosyncrasy credit. The peer nominations were tabulated and the five persons with the most high nominations were designated as the high nominees and the five persons with the most low nominations were termed the low nominees. The high and low nominees completed the Adjective Check List, which assessed personality traits, and a questionnaire which contained demographic and biographic items. All faculty members within each division were asked to rate the high and low nominees on the variables of task competency, appearance, speaking ability, external status, and extent of nonconformity.

Comparisons were made between the high and low nominees on each of the variables studied. The statistical tests used to analyze the data consisted of $\underline{t}$ tests, Mann-Whitney $\underline{U}$ tests, and chi-square.

In addition to the aforementioned analyses, the approximate level of significance for each computed value was determined, as well as an estimate of the strength of association.

Discussion of Findings

General findings

This study found a strong, consistent, positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency. This finding is in agreement with Hollander's (1958) theory of idiosyncrasy credit and the experimental research which has been conducted on the theory. It appears that Hollander's contention that idiosyncrasy credit is related to task competency is not only valid in experimental studies but is in agreement with real on-going social systems in education.

The findings of this study are also in agreement with Hollander's thesis that one's idiosyncrasy credit is related to his status external to the group. A consistent positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and external status. The individuals perceived to have high idiosyncrasy credit were also perceived to hold higher external status than the low nominees.

The relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior was inconsistent. The high nominees were perceived to exhibit a greater amount of idiosyncratic behavior than the low nominees at a statistically significant level in four of the six divisions in the sample population. In one division the difference was slight and in another the direction of the difference was reversed. The strength of the association between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior varied considerably from one division to another. Hollander contended that an individual with high idiosyncrasy credit has the potential to display more idiosyncratic behavior than others but might not choose to do so. The findings of this study suggest that the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior may depend upon the situation.

This study also found a positive relationship between speaking ability and idiosyncrasy credit. The faculty members with high idiosyncrasy credit were also perceived to be better speakers. Hollander did not mention speaking ability in his theory of idiosyncrasy credit. It must be noted, however, that the factor analysis of items included in Form R showed that speaking ability was highly correlated with the factors which comprised task competency. Therefore, one might conclude that speaking ability is not a distinct component of idiosyncrasy credit but is in association with task competency.

No consistent positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming. In an academic division of one college the high nominees were rated significantly higher than the low nominees and in another division the direction was reversed. Hollander did not mention appearance and grooming in his theory of idiosyncrasy credit. The variable was included in this study because of curiosity of the investigator. The data suggest that the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming may again depend upon the situation.

Hollander hypothesized that the characteristics of an individual known to other group members are associated with idiosyncrasy credit. Hollander was not specific as to what these characteristics are. This study asked questions regarding the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and selected demographic and biographic items thought to be associated with idiosyncrasy credit.

A positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and the sex of the target nominees. The data showed that fewer women than men received high idiosyncrasy credit nominations. One must note, however, that the community college faculties investigated in this study were predominantly male. Also, a high level of statistical significance was found only when all nominees were pooled.

A positive relationship was also found between idiosyncrasy credit and the number of earned college degrees. The data showed that the high nominees had earned more degrees than the low nominees. This finding is consistent with the relationship which was also found between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency in this study.

No consistent relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and age, number of academic honors, or number of memberships held in professional organizations. The data suggested that such variables are of no consequence when considering idiosyncrasy credit. A positive relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and number of memberships held on college committees, however, was found in one college division.

The nature of the relationship between duration of group affiliation and idiosyncrasy credit was not clearly demonstrated in this study. This finding is somewhat inconsistent with Hollander's theory and

1961 research where a positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and duration of affiliation with a group in an experimental setting. In conducting this research project, however, the investigator noticed that rarely did an individual who was new to the group receive a high nomination. It is also important to note that the oldest institution studied was ten years old at the time of the investigation. Therefore, one may speculate upon the effect that this had upon the difference between mean age scores.

A positive relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published journal articles. No strong relationship was found, however, between idiosyncrasy credit and number of published books or monographs. An examination of the analyzed data indicated that few publications of any nature were generated by the faculty members studied. One might note that the community college philosophically places less emphasis on publication and research than do universities.

This study investigated the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and the personality scales yielded by the Adjective Check List. Hollander's idiosyncrasy credit theory served as the basis for hypothesis construction regarding two variables. The hypotheses in this study stated that the individuals perceived as having high idiosyncrasy credit would also indicate a higher need for intraception and need for affiliation than the low nominees. Questions were asked in this study in regard to the other personality scales where Hollander did not infer a relationship with idiosyncrasy credit.

No positive relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and the hypothesized variables of need for intraception and need for affiliation. Hollander theorized that idiosyncrasy credit is related to an individual's motivation to affiliate. To test that relationship the Adjective Check List scale of need for affiliation was used. To test the relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and perceptual ability the ACL scale of need for intraception was used.

One might speculate that there actually was no strong relationship between idiosyncrasy credit and Hollander's perceptual ability and motivation to affiliate. On the other hand, it is possible that the two scales used in this study to test the relationships were not operational interpretations of Hollander's terms. One might also speculate upon the discriminatory ability of the ACL among college teachers.

No statistically significant relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and the personality variables where questions were asked. A number of tendencies, however, were noted. The tendencies found seem to be consistent with the theory of idiosyncrasy credit. High idiosyncrasy credit holders tended to score higher than the low credit holders in regard to the variables of self-confidence, need for dominance, need for achievement, need for heterosexuality, need for agression and need for exhibition. Low idiosyncrasy credit holders tended to score higher on need for abasement (to express feelings of inferiority) and need for deference (to seek and sustain subordinate roles) than the high credit holders. For a complete explanation of the definitions of Adjective Check List scales see Appendix A. Inferences regarding the aforementioned tendencies should be made with caution. The data suggest, however, that such variables might be taken into consideration when investigating idiosyncrasy credit.

No consistent relationships were found to exist between idiosyncrasy credit and the following personality scales: total number of adjectives checked, number of favorable adjectives checked, number of unfavorable adjectives checked, lability, personal adjustment, need for endurance, need for order, need for nurturance, need for autonomy, need for aggression, need for change, and need for succorance.

Situational findings

This study investigated idiosyncrasy credit among six divisions, two divisions in each of three community colleges. A science division was involved within each college, a social science division in each of two colleges, and a humanities division in one. The faculty members within the science divisions taught higher mathematics or biological or physical science. The subjects of history, sociology, and political science were the primary subjects taught by the faculty members in the social sciences divisions. The faculty members within the humanities division taught art, music, philosophy or speech.

The variables of task competency, external status, and appearance and grooming were found to have a statistically significant positive relationship with idiosyncrasy credit across all divisions. The strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and the aforementioned variables varied considerably, however, between the humanities division and the other divisions investigated. An inspection of the analyzed results for the humanities division revealed that the strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior was far stronger than in other divisions. Correspondingly, the strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and external status and between idiosyncrasy credit and task competency was lower in the humanities division than in other divisions. In all divisions except the humanities division the high idiosyncrasy credit nominees scored higher on appearance and grooming than the low nominees. The faculty members who were perceived to be low idiosyncrasy credit holders in the humanities division were rated higher than the high nominees in regard to appearance and grooming.

The data suggest that the humanities situation was unique. The high nominees were perceived as exhibiting an extremely high amount of idiosyncratic behavior. The data suggest that possibly idiosyncratic behavior may have been required to gain idiosyncrasy credit or that the high idiosyncrasy credit holders felt very free to exercise idiosyncratic behavior. The exercise of idiosyncratic behavior appears to be confirmed by the reversal on the variable of appearance and grooming where the low nominees were rated higher than the high nominees. Possibly, the high nominees were exhibiting idiosyncratic behavior through their comparatively poor appearance and grooming. In conclusion, the data suggest the particular situation may have a strong impact upon the strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and the variables which are found to be significantly related with it.

Conclusions

1. Faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit were also perceived by their peers as being more competent in task related activities than the faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit.
2. Faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit were also perceived by their peers as having a greater amount of status which is external to the group than the faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit.
3. The strength and direction of the association between idiosyncrasy credit and idiosyncratic behavior depends upon the situation.
4. Faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit were also perceived by their peers as having a greater speaking ability than the low nominees. The factor analysis of the instrument used to gain ratings of speaking ability and task competency, however, revealed a high correlation between the two items.
5. No consistent relationship was found between idiosyncrasy credit and appearance and grooming.
6. Faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit also seemed to possess a greater number of earned college degrees.
7. More males were perceived to have high idiosyncrasy credit than the number perceived to have low idiosyncrasy credit. More females were perceived to have low idiosyncrasy credit than the number perceived to have high idiosyncrasy credit.

8. Faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit published more journal articles than low nominees.
9. No consistent relationships were found between idiosyncrasy credit and age, number of academic honors, number of memberships held in professional organizations, number of published books or monographs, and number of memberships in college committees.
10. No strong relationships were determined to exist between idiosyncrasy credit and the following personality scales: total number of adjectives checked, number of favorable adjectives checked, number of unfavorable adjectives checked, lability, personal adjustment, need for endurance, need for order, need for nurturance, need for autonomy, need for aggression, need for change, and need for succorance.
11. The faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit tended to score higher than the faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit in regard to the variable of self-confidence, need for dominance, need for achievement, need for heterosexuality, need for aggression, and need for exhibition. The faculty members who were perceived by their peers as having high idiosyncrasy credit tended to score lower on the scales of need for abasement and need for deference than the faculty members with low idiosyncrasy credit. Although the results of the data analyses suggested that there might be such relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and the aforementioned variables the statistical levels of confidence were not substantial.

12. The results of the data analyses indicated that the relationships between idiosyncrasy credit and the variables studied were consistent in their direction and levels of significance with a few exceptions. The computed strength of association between idiosyncrasy credit and the various variables fluctuated considerably, however, from one situation to another. The data suggested that the situation may account for the strength of the association between idiosyncrasy credit and the variables.
13. In general, the findings of this study give strong support to Hollander's (1958) theory of idiosyncrasy credit. This study also introduced a number of added individual characteristics which were found to be related to idiosyncrasy credit among faculty members within academic divisions at the community college level.

Implications

The findings of this study provide practicing educational leaders with the results of an empirical investigation of a behavioral science theory in an on-going educational social system.

Through an awareness of the theory of idiosyncrasy credit and the results of this study practitioners may be better equipped to understand status and conformity within social systems and particularly among faculty members in their respective academic groupings. Also, practicing leaders may want to learn of the idiosyncrasy credit levels of teachers as a method of selecting the individual with the most leadership potential. A practicing leader might achieve better group cohesiveness through assisting low idiosyncrasy credit holders in raising their levels of idiosyncrasy credit. For example, this might be accomplished by allowing an individual to display his task competency.

Through an awareness of theory of idiosyncrasy credit and the results of this study, participants in social systems may be able to understand why some individuals can exhibit variant behavior and not be penalized, whereas, if another exhibited the same behavior, sanctions would be imposed by the group. Through an understanding of the theory, participants in social systems, such as teachers, may be able to manipulate their own credit levels and calculate the extent to which they might engage in variant behavior.

The results of this study demonstrate that the theory of idiosyncrasy credit seems to operate within on-going social systems and is more than a hypothetical construct. Such a finding should have implications for the behavioral sciences in general and serve as a basis for further research.

In regard to research design, this study demonstrates that it is possible to rank individuals according to their idiosyncrasy credit levels within an on-going social system. This achievement provides an operational base for further investigations.

The results of this study provoke a series of questions which could be investigated. Would different conclusions be drawn if this investigation were replicated in other two-year colleges, four-year colleges, or in the public schools? Would a case study approach offer additional insights into the application of the idiosyncrasy credit theory in on-going social systems? Does an individual's idiosyncrasy credit level have a tendency to remain constant across all of the social systems in which he holds membership? Would the peer appraisal of personality traits offer any advantages over the self-appraisal method used in this study? To what extent does an individual's idiosyncrasy credit balance change over time? What is the correlation among peer idiosyncrasy credit ratings, administrator ratings, and student ratings? What variables other than those investigated in this study are associated with idiosyncrasy credit?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alvarez, R. Informal reactions to deviance in simulated work organizations: A laboratory experiment. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 895-912.

Anderhalter, O.F., et. al. Technical Report No. 2, St. Louis: St. Louis University, 1952. Cited in Hollander E. P., Leaders, groups, and influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Appleweig, M. H. & Moeller G. Conforming behavior and personality variables. Technical Report 8, Contract NONR 996 (02), Connecticut College, 1958.

Bass, A.R., Fiedler, F. E. & Krueger, S. Personality correlates of assumed similarity and related scores, A technical report, 1964, cited in Fiedler, F.E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Beloff, H. Two forms of social conformity: acquiesence and conventionality, Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 99-104.

Berg, I.A. & Bass, B.M. (Ed.) Conformity and Deviation. New York: Harper Brothers Publishers, 1961.

Berkowitz, L., & Macaulay, J.R. Some effects of differences in status level and status stability. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 135-148.

Boles, H.W. Leaders, leading and leadership. Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, 1969.

Boles, H.W. Class notes. Western Michigan University, January 1970.

Boros, O.K. The sixth mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

Bryan, R.C. Instructor Image Questionnaire. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Student Reaction Center, Western Michigan University, 1958.

Coats, W.D. Instructor Image Questionnaire. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Educator Feedback Center, Western Michigan University, 1969.

Crutchfield, R.S. Conformity and character. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 191-198.

Dittes, J.E. & Kelley, H.H. Effects of different conditions upon conformity to group norms. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 100-107.

Downie, N.M. p. 513 cited in Boros, O.K. *The sixth mental measurement yearbook*. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

Edwards, A.L., *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* (manual). New York: The psychological Corp., 1954.

Fiedler, F.E. *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Gough, G.H., Heilbrun, A.B. *The adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.

Harvey, O.J. & Consalvi, C. Status and conformity to pressures in informal groups. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1960, 60, 182-187.

Hays, W. *Statistics for psychologists*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Heilbrun, A.B. Relatinnships between the Adjective Check List, Personal Preference Schedule and desirability factors under varying defensiveness conditions. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1958, 14, 283-287.

Heilbrun, A.B. Personality differences between adjusted and maladjusted college students. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1960, 44, 341-346.

Hoffman, M.C. Conformity as a defense mechanism and a form of resistance to genuine group influence. *Journal of Personality*, 1957, 25, 412-424.

Hollander, E.P. Buddy ratings: Military research and industrial applications. *Personnel Psychology*, 1954, 7, 385-393.

Hollander, E. P. The friendship factor in peer nominations, *Personnel Psychology*, 1956, 9, 435-447.

Hollander, E. P. The reliability of peer nominations under various conditions of administration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1957, 41, 2, 445-448.

Hollander, E.P. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit, *Psychological Review*, 1958, 64, 117-127.

Hollander, E.P. Competence and conformity in the acceptance of influence, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1960, 65, 365-370.

Hollander, E.P. Some effects of perceived status on responses to innovative behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, 63, 247-250.

Hollander, E.P. *Leaders, groups, and influence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Julian, J.W., & Steiner, I.D. Perceived acceptance as a determinant of conformity behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 55, 191-198.

Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Krebs, A.M. Two determinants of conformity, age of independence training and achievement, Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 130-131.

Lippitt, R., Polansky, N., & Rosen S. The dynamics of power, Human Relations, 1952, 5, 37-64.

Luchins, A.S. & Luchins, E.H. Previous experience with ambiguous and nonambiguous stimuli under various social influences. Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 42, 249-270.

Moeller, G. & Applezweig, M.K. A motivational factor in conformity, Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 114-120.

Mouton, J.S., Blake R.R. & Olmstead, J.A. The relationship between frequency of yielding and their disclosure of personal identity, Journal of Personality, 1956, 24, 339-396.

Popham, W.J. Educational statistics. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Richardson, R.C. Needed: New directions in administration. Junior College Journal, 1970, 40, 16-22.

Sabath, G. The effect of disruption and individual status on perception and group attraction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1964, 119-130.

Samelson, F. Conforming behavior under two conditions of conflict in the cognitive field. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 181-187.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Travers, R.M.W. An introduction to educational research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Tuddenham, R.D. The influence upon judgment of a grossly distorted norm, Technical Report 2, Contract NR, University of California, 1957.

Wahrman, R. High status, deviance and sanctions, Sociometry, 1970, 33, 485-504.

Webb, W.B. & Hollander, E.P. Comparison of three morale measures: A survey, pooled group judgments, and self evaluation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40, 17-20.

West Point Military Academy 1948, 1949, cited in Hollander, E.P. Leaders, groups and influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Wherry, R.J., & Fryer, D.H. Buddy ratings: Popularity contest or leadership criterion? Personnel Psychology, 1947, 11, 283-291.

Williams, S.B., & Leavitt, H.J. Group opinion as a predictor of military leadership. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1947, 11, 283-291.

Wiggins, J.A., Dill, F., & Schwartz, R.D. On "status-liability." Sociometry, 1965, 28, 197-209.

Wolthuis, R.M. A study of factors related to student ratings of college instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1970.

Yates, F. Contingency tables involving small numbers and the x^2 test, 1934, cited in Popham, W.J. Educational statistics. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Zander, A.& Cohen, A.R. Attributed social power and group acceptance. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 490-2.

APPENDIX A

Definitions of the Scales and Indices Yielded by the Adjective Check List

Adapted from Gough, G. H., Heilbrun, A. B. *The adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.

1. Total number of adjectives checked. (No. Ckd.) The individual high on this variable tends to be described as emotional, adventurous, wholesome, conservative, enthusiastic, unintelligent, frank and helpful. He is active, apparently means well, but tends to blunder. The man with low scores tends more often to be quiet and reserved, more tentative and cautious in his approach to problems, and perhaps unduly taciturn and aloof. He is more apt to think originally and inventively, but is perhaps less effective in getting things done.

2. Number of favorable adjectives checked. (Fav.) The individual who checks many words in the list of 75 appears to be motivated by a strong desire to do well and to impress others, but always by virtue of hard work and conventional endeavor. The reaction of others is to see him as dependable, steady, conscientious, mannerly, and serious; there is also a suspicion that he may be too concerned about others, and lacking in verve and quickness of mind. The low-scoring subject is much more of an individual--more often seen as clever, sharp-witted, headstrong, pleasure-seeking, and more original in thought and behavior. His emotions being more accessible, he also more often experiences anxiety, self-doubts, and perplexities.

3. Number of unfavorable adjectives checked. (Unfav.) The high-scoring subject strikes others as rebellious, careless, conceited, and cynical. He tends to be a disbeliever, skeptic, and a threat to the complacent beliefs and attitudes of his fellows. The low-scorer is more placid, more obliging, more mannerly, more tactful, and probably less intelligent.

4. Self-confidence (S-Cfd) A high-scorer is assertive, affiliative, outgoing, persistent, and actionist. He wants to get things done, and is impatient with people or things standing in his way. He is concerned about creating a good impression, and is not able cutting a few corners to achieve this objective. He makes a distinct impression on others, who see him forceful, self-confident, determined, ambitious, and opportunistic. The low-scoring person is a much less effective person in the everyday sense of the word--he has difficulty in mobilizing himself and taking action, prefering inaction and contemplation. Others see him as unassuming, forgetful, mild, preoccupied, reserved, and retiring.

5. Self-Control (S-Cn) High scorers tend to be serious, sober individuals, interested in and responsive to their obligations. They are seen as diligent, practical, and loyal workers. At the same time there may be an element of over-control, too much emphasis on the proper means for attaining the ends of social living. The low scorer seems to be inadequately socialized, headstrong, irresponsible, complaining, disorderly, narcissistic, and impulsive.

6. Lability (Lab) The high-scoring subject is seen favorably as spontaneous, but unfavorably as excitable, temperamental, restless, nervous, and high-strung. The low scorer is more phlegmatic, routinized, planful, and conventional. He is described by observers as thorough, organized, steady, and unemotional.

7. Personal Adjustment (Per Adj) The high scoring subject is seen as dependable, peaceful, trusting, friendly, practical, loyal, and wholesome. The low-scoring subject sees himself as at odds with other people and as moody and dissatisfied. This view is reciprocated by observers, who describe the low scorer as aloof, defensive, anxious, inhibited, worrying, withdrawn, and unfriendly.

8. Need for Achievement (Ach) Definition: To strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance. The high-scoring subject is usually seen as intelligent and hard-working, but also as involved in his intellectual endeavors. He is determined to do well and usually succeeds. The low scoring subject is more skeptical, more dubious about the rewards which might come from effort and involvement and uncertain about risking his labors. He seems to be somewhat withdrawn and dissatisfied with his current status.

9. Dominance (Dom) Definition: To seek and sustain leadership roles in groups or to be influential and controlling in individual relationships. The high scorer is a forceful, strong-willed, and persevering individual. He is confident of his ability to do what he wishes and is direct and forthright in his behavior. The low scorer on Dom is unsure of himself, and indifferent to both the demands and challenges of interpersonal life. He stays out of the limelight, and avoids situations calling for choice and decision-making.

10. Endurance (End) Definition: To persist in any task undertaken.

The subject high on End is typically self-controlled and responsible, but also idealistic and concerned about truth and justice. By nature conventional, he may nonetheless find himself championing unconventional ideas and unpopular causes. The low scorer on End is erratic and impatient, intolerant of prolonged effort or attention, and apt to change in an abrupt and quixotic manner.

11. Order (Ord) Definition: To place special emphasis on neatness, organization, and planning in one's activities. High scorers on Ord are usually sincere and dependable, but at the cost of individuality and spontaneity. These selfdenying and inhibitory trends may actually interfere with the attainment of the harmony and psychic order which they seek. Low scorers are quicker in temperament and reaction, and might often be called impulsive. They prefer complexity and variety, and dislike delay, caution and deliberation.

12. Intraception (Int) Definition: To engage in attempts to understand one's own behavior or the behavior of others. The high scorer on Int is reflective and serious, as would be expected; he is also capable, conscientious, and knowledgeable. His intellectual talents are excellent and he derives pleasure from their exercise. The low scorer may also have talent, but he tends toward profligacy and intemperateness in its use. He is aggressive in manner, and quickly becomes bored or impatient with a situation where direct action is not possible. He is a doer, not a thinker.

13. Nurturance (Nur) Definition: To engage in behaviors which extend material or emotional benefits to others. The subject high on this scale is of a helpful, nurturant disposition, but sometimes too bland and self-disciplined. His dependability and benevolence are worthy qualities, but he may nonetheless be too conventional and solicitous of the other person. The subject scoring low on Nur is the opposite: skeptical, clever, and acute, but too self-centered and too little attentive to the feelings and wishes of others.

14. Affiliation (Aff) Definition: To seek and sustain numerous personal friendships. The high scorer on Aff is adaptable and anxious to please, but not necessarily because of altruistic motives; i.e., he is ambitious and concerned with position, and may tend to exploit others and his relationships with them in order to gain his ends. The low scorer is more individualistic and strong-willed, though perhaps not out of inner resourcefulness and independence. He tends to be less trusting, more pessimistic about life, and restless in any situation which intensifies or prolongs his contacts with others.

15. Heterosexuality (Het) Definition: To seek the company of and derive emotional satisfactions from interactions with opposite sexed peers. The high scorer on Het is interested in the opposite sex as he is interested in life, experience, and most things around him in a healthy, direct, and outgoing manner. He may even be a bit naive in the friendly ingenuousness in which he approaches others. The low scorer thinks too much,

as it were, and dampens his vitality; he tends to be dispirited, inhibited, shrewd and calculating in his interpersonal relationships.

16. Exhibition (Exh) Definition: To behave in such a way as to elicit the immediate attention of others. Persons who are high on this scale tend to be self-centered and even narcissistic. They are poised, self-assured, and able to meet situations with aplomb, but at the same time they are quick tempered and irritable. In their dealings with others they are apt to be opportunistic and manipulative. Persons who score low tend toward apathy, self-doubt, and undue inhibition of impulse. They lack confidence in themselves and shrink from any encounter in which they will be visible or "on stage."

17. Autonomy (Aut) Definition: To act independently of others or of social values and expectations. The high scorer on Aut is independent and autonomous, but also assertive and self-willed. He tends to be indifferent to the feelings of others and heedless of their preferences when he himself wishes to act. The low scorer is of a moderate and even subdued disposition. He hesitates to take the initiative, preferring to wait and follow the dictates of others.

18. Aggression (Agg) Definition: To engage in behaviors which attack or hurt others. The individual high on this scale is both competitive and aggressive. He seeks to win, to vanquish, and views others as rivals. His impulses are strong, and often under-controlled. In an appropriate situation he may drive

on to worthy attainment, but often his behavior will be self-aggrandizing and disruptive. The individual who is low on Agg is much more of a conformist, but not necessarily lacking in courage or tenacity. He tends to be patiently diligent, and sincere in his relationships with others.

19. Change (Cha) Definition: To seek novelty or experience and avoid routine. Persons high on Cha are typically perceptive, alert, and spontaneous individuals who comprehend problems and situations rapidly and incisively and who take pleasure in change and variety. They have confidence in themselves and welcome the challenges to be found in disorder and complexity. The low scorer seeks stability and continuity in his environment, and is apprehensive of ill-defined and risk-involving situations. In temperament he is patient and obliging, concerned about others, but lacking in verve and energy.

20. Succorance (Suc) Definition: To solicit sympathy, affection, or emotional support from others. Suc appears to depict, at its high end, a personality which is trusting, guileless, and even naive in its faith in the integrity and benevolence of others. The high scorer is dependent on others, seeks support, and expects to find it. The low scorer, on the contrary, is independent, resourceful, and self-sufficient, but at the same time prudent and circumspect. He has a sort of quiet confidence in his own worth and capability.

21. Abasement (Aba) Definition: To express feelings of inferiority through self-criticism, guilt, or social impotence. High

scorers on Aba are not only submissive and self-effacing, but also appear to have problems of self-acceptance. They see themselves as weak and undeserving, and face the world with anxiety and foreboding. Their behavior is often self-punishing, perhaps in the hope of forestalling criticism and rejection from without. The low scorer is optimistic, poised, productive, and decisive. Not fearing others, he is alert and responsive to them. His tempo is brisk, his manner confident, and his behavior effective.

22. Deference (Def) Definition: To seek and sustain subordinate roles in relationships with others. The individual scoring high on Def is typically conscientious, dependable, and persevering. He is self-denying not so much out of any fear of others or inferiority to them as out of a preference for anonymity and freedom from stress and external demands. He attends modestly to his affairs, seeking little, and yielding always to any reasonable claim by another. The individual with a low score in Def is more energetic, spontaneous, and independent; he likes attention, likes to supervise and direct others, and to express his will. He is also ambitious, and is not above taking advantage of others and coercing them if he can attain a goal in so doing.

APPENDIX B

Instrumentation

Nomination Form
Form R
Adjective Check List
Demographic Information Form

Nomination Form

Observers have noticed that within a group, certain prestigious individuals can exhibit behavior that would bring prompt and punitive sanctions upon lesser persons. Certain individuals can say certain things and get away with it, whereas others would incur group ridicule or punishment for an identical act. Some have thought that those persons who have the ability to set away with more, if they choose to do so, have a type of group awarded status. Researchers are uncertain as to the causes of group awarded status. Possibly, this status is the result of task competency, physical appearance, academic degrees, seniority or a combination of those and other factors. This research project is an attempt toward gaining a greater understanding of such causes.

This study will attempt to determine which faculty members in your division have high group awarded status and a greater ability to nonconform. The following are possible examples of such nonconformity: tardiness at meetings, remarks which oppose an established principle in your discipline, or bizarre patterns of dress or grooming. This study also seeks to learn which individuals have low status and the least freedom to deviate.

From the list of faculty names below please nominate the high five individuals in your division who have high status and could get away with the most if they chose to do so. Please remember that this may or may not be the same as what they actually get away with. Also, nominate the low five individuals who have low status and the least freedom to deviate from group expectations, if they elect to do so. Please feel free to nominate yourself if appropriate. Do not include the division chairman among your nominations.

High Five (Greatest Status and Freedom to Deviate)	Low Five (Least Status and Freedom to Deviate)
1.________________________	1.________________________
2.________________________	2.________________________
3.________________________	3.________________________
4.________________________	4.________________________
5.________________________	5.________________________

Faculty Names:

____

Your cooperation in this research is sincerely appreciated, and you can be assured that the information you give will be held in strict confidence. At no time will any personal information supplied by you be released to anyone at your college or elsewhere. Neither your division nor college will be identified in a description of the research. Your complete anonymity is assured.

Please return by__________ to: Brent Knight, 1186 River Valley Drive
Apt. F-12, Flint, Michigan 48504

Form R

Please rate __________ on a 1 through 7 basis (7 highest, 1 lowest) in response to the following questions. Rate in comparison with other faculty members in your division.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence.

	Low						High
1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. TEACHING ABILITY:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. CONTRIBUTION TOWARD DIVISIONAL OBJECTIVES:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. SPEAKING ABILITY:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. APPEARANCE AND GROOMING:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS AS A FACULTY MEMBER:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. STATUS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY: (To what extent is this faculty member known and respected within the community?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. STATUS WITHIN HIS DISCIPLINE OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE: (To what extent is this faculty member known and respected by other professionals in his discipline within the region, state or nation?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Conformity						Nonconformity
10. DEGREE OF NONCONFORMITY: (To what extent has this faculty member violated group expectations within the last year; e.g. made remarks contrary to established principles or bizarre dress or grooming, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please return by __________ 1970 to:

Brent Knight
1186 River Valley Drive
Apt. F-12
Flint, Michigan 48504

NAME (see directions below)

SEX: MALE ○ FEMALE ○

AGE ____ DATE ____ SCHOOL ____

NCS ANSWER SHEET FOR

THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

BY HARRISON G. GOUGH

Copyright 1952 by Harrison G. Gough, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley

Published by Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Ave., Palo Alto, Calif.

DIRECTIONS FOR USING NCS ANSWER SHEET

This answer sheet contains a list of 300 adjectives. Please read them quickly and blacken in the circle beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and fill the circles for the adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be. **BE SURE TO TURN THE PAGE OVER** and continue through adjective No. 300 on the reverse side.

● Use No. 2½ or softer pencil ● Fill circles heavily ● Erase any errors or stray marks completely ● Do not use ball point or ink ● Example: ●

1 ○ absent-minded
2 ○ active
3 ○ adaptable
4 ○ adventurous
5 ○ affected
6 ○ affectionate
7 ○ aggressive
8 ○ alert
9 ○ aloof
10 ○ ambitious
11 ○ anxious
12 ○ apathetic
13 ○ appreciative
14 ○ argumentative
15 ○ arrogant
16 ○ artistic
17 ○ assertive
18 ○ attractive
19 ○ autocratic
20 ○ awkward
21 ○ bitter
22 ○ blustery
23 ○ boastful
24 ○ bossy
25 ○ calm
26 ○ capable
27 ○ careless
28 ○ cautious
29 ○ changeable
30 ○ charming
31 ○ cheerful
32 ○ civilized
33 ○ clear-thinking
34 ○ clever
35 ○ coarse
36 ○ cold
37 ○ commonplace
38 ○ complaining
39 ○ complicated
40 ○ conceited
41 ○ confident
42 ○ confused
43 ○ conscientious
44 ○ conservative
45 ○ considerate
46 ○ contented
47 ○ conventional
48 ○ cool
49 ○ cooperative
50 ○ courageous
51 ○ cowardly
52 ○ cruel
53 ○ curious
54 ○ cynical
55 ○ daring
56 ○ deceitful
57 ○ defensive
58 ○ deliberate
59 ○ demanding
60 ○ dependable
61 ○ dependent
62 ○ despondent
63 ○ determined
64 ○ dignified
65 ○ discreet
66 ○ disorderly
67 ○ dissatisfied
68 ○ distractible
69 ○ distrustful
70 ○ dominant
71 ○ dreamy
72 ○ dull
73 ○ easy going
74 ○ effeminate
75 ○ efficient
76 ○ egotistical
77 ○ emotional
78 ○ energetic
79 ○ enterprising
80 ○ enthusiastic
81 ○ evasive
82 ○ excitable
83 ○ fair-minded
84 ○ fault-finding
85 ○ fearful
86 ○ feminine
87 ○ fickle
88 ○ flirtatious
89 ○ foolish
90 ○ forceful
91 ○ foresighted
92 ○ forgetful
93 ○ forgiving
94 ○ formal
95 ○ frank
96 ○ friendly
97 ○ frivolous
98 ○ fussy
99 ○ generous
100 ○ gentle
101 ○ gloomy
102 ○ good-looking
103 ○ good-natured
104 ○ greedy
105 ○ handsome
106 ○ hard-headed
107 ○ hard-hearted
108 ○ hasty
109 ○ headstrong
110 ○ healthy
111 ○ helpful
112 ○ high-strung
113 ○ honest
114 ○ hostile
115 ○ humorous
116 ○ hurried
117 ○ idealistic
118 ○ imaginative
119 ○ immature
120 ○ impatient
121 ○ impulsive
122 ○ independent
123 ○ indifferent
124 ○ individualistic
125 ○ industrious
126 ○ infantile
127 ○ informal
128 ○ ingenious
129 ○ inhibited
130 ○ initiative
131 ○ insightful
132 ○ intelligent
133 ○ interests narrow
134 ○ interests wide
135 ○ intolerant
136 ○ inventive
137 ○ irresponsible
138 ○ irritable
139 ○ jolly
140 ○ kind
141 ○ lazy
142 ○ leisurely
143 ○ logical
144 ○ loud
145 ○ loyal
146 ○ mannerly
147 ○ masculine
148 ○ mature
149 ○ meek
150 ○ methodical

DIRECTIONS FOR USING NAME GRID: In the boxes above, print your last name first. Skip a box, then print as much of your first name as possible. Below each box blacken the circle that is lettered the same as the letter in the box. Blacken the blank circle for spaces.

I. D. NO. SPECIAL CODES
(use only as directed)

FOR NCS USE ONLY

CONTINUE ON REVERSE SIDE →

Scored by NATIONAL COMPUTER SYSTEMS,
1015 So. 6th Street, Minneapolis, Minn. 55415

NCS PA 1036

● Use No. 2½ or softer pencil ● Fill circles heavily ● Erase any errors or stray marks completely ● Do not use ball point or ink

151 ○ mild
152 ○ mischievous
153 ○ moderate
154 ○ modest
155 ○ moody
156 ○ nagging
157 ○ natural
158 ○ nervous
159 ○ noisy
160 ○ obliging
161 ○ obnoxious
162 ○ opinionated
163 ○ opportunistic
164 ○ optimistic
165 ○ organized
166 ○ original
167 ○ outgoing
168 ○ outspoken
169 ○ painstaking
170 ○ patient
171 ○ peaceable
172 ○ peculiar
173 ○ persevering
174 ○ persistent
175 ○ pessimistic
176 ○ planful
177 ○ pleasant
178 ○ pleasure-seeking
179 ○ poised
180 ○ polished
181 ○ practical
182 ○ praising
183 ○ precise
184 ○ prejudiced
185 ○ preoccupied
186 ○ progressive
187 ○ prudish
188 ○ quarrelsome
189 ○ queer
190 ○ quick
191 ○ quiet
192 ○ quitting
193 ○ rational
194 ○ rattlebrained
195 ○ realistic
196 ○ reasonable
197 ○ rebellious
198 ○ reckless
199 ○ reflective
200 ○ relaxed
201 ○ reliable
202 ○ resentful
203 ○ reserved
204 ○ resourceful
205 ○ responsible
206 ○ restless
207 ○ retiring
208 ○ rigid
209 ○ robust
210 ○ rude
211 ○ sarcastic
212 ○ self-centered
213 ○ self-confident
214 ○ self-controlled
215 ○ self-denying
216 ○ self-pitying
217 ○ self-punishing
218 ○ self-seeking
219 ○ selfish
220 ○ sensitive
221 ○ sentimental
222 ○ serious
223 ○ severe
224 ○ sexy
225 ○ shallow
226 ○ sharp-witted
227 ○ shiftless
228 ○ show-off
229 ○ shrewd
230 ○ shy
231 ○ silent
232 ○ simple
233 ○ sincere
234 ○ slipshod
235 ○ slow
236 ○ sly
237 ○ smug
238 ○ snobbish
239 ○ sociable
240 ○ soft-hearted
241 ○ sophisticated
242 ○ spendthrift
243 ○ spineless
244 ○ spontaneous
245 ○ spunky
246 ○ stable
247 ○ steady
248 ○ stern
249 ○ stingy
250 ○ stolid
251 ○ strong
252 ○ stubborn
253 ○ submissive
254 ○ suggestible
255 ○ sulky
256 ○ superstitious
257 ○ suspicious
258 ○ sympathetic
259 ○ tactful
260 ○ tactless
261 ○ talkative
262 ○ temperamental
263 ○ tense
264 ○ thankless
265 ○ thorough
266 ○ thoughtful
267 ○ thrifty
268 ○ timid
269 ○ tolerant
270 ○ touchy
271 ○ tough
272 ○ trusting
273 ○ unaffected
274 ○ unambitious
275 ○ unassuming
276 ○ unconventional
277 ○ undependable
278 ○ understanding
279 ○ unemotional
280 ○ unexcitable
281 ○ unfriendly
282 ○ uninhibited
283 ○ unintelligent
284 ○ unkind
285 ○ unrealistic
286 ○ unscrupulous
287 ○ unselfish
288 ○ unstable
289 ○ vindictive
290 ○ versatile
291 ○ warm
292 ○ wary
293 ○ weak
294 ○ whiny
295 ○ wholesome
296 ○ wise
297 ○ withdrawn
298 ○ witty
299 ○ worrying
300 ○ zany

Demographic Information Form

1. Name__________________ 2. Age_____________ 3. Sex___________
4. Marital Status: Single___, Married___, Separated___, Divorced___
5. Number of years seniority within the college_________
6. Do you have tenure?_________
7. Please list your college degrees, majors, name of institution and year earned.

Degree	Subject Major	Institution where earned	Year

8. List the academic honors you have received.

9. List the number of job related professional organizations to which you belong. _________

10. List in chronological order the job titles and dates of your previous employment.

Job Title	Inclusive Dates

11. How many published journal articles have you written which are related to your discipline or profession? _________
12. How many published books or monographs have you written which are related to your discipline or profession? _________
13. List the social, community, and church organizations to which you belong and the offices you hold or have held.

Organization	Offices

14. List the committees which you presently participate in at your college.

APPENDIX C

Communications

Reminder Notice 1
Reminder Notice 2
Introductory Letter to the Target Subjects
Introductory Letter to the Non-Target Subjects

Reminder Notice 1

TO: Faculty in the Social Science Division

FROM: Brent Knight, Doctoral Candidate, W.M.U.

REGARDING: Participation in the Research Project on Idiosyncrasy Credit

If you have completed and forwarded the nomination form which I gave you, please disregard this note. If you have not forwarded the nomination form, please do so at your earliest convenience. I sincerely appreciate your cooperation in the research project.

Reminder Notice 2

To: Faculty in the Social Science Division

From: Brent Knight, Doctoral Candidate, W.M.U.

Regarding: Participation in the research project on idiosyncrasy credit

Thank you for your continued cooperation in the research project which I am conducting. If you have not forwarded the forms which I gave you, please do so. I plan to send you an abstract of the findings of the study as soon as the data are analyzed.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

1186 River Valley Drive
Flint, Michigan 48504
November, 1970

Dear Participating Faculty Member:

A few weeks ago I asked you, and the other faculty members in your division, to nominate your peers on the basis of your perception of their status and freedom to deviate. Most of the faculty members in your division completed the nomination form. I am very appreciative of the faculty cooperation which I received in implementing the first phase of the study.

I am now attempting, with your continued cooperation, to complete the second and final phase of the study. I have enclosed nine peer evaluation forms, the Adjective Check List, and a demographic information form. Please fill them out to the best of your ability.

The Adjective Check List will require about fifteen minutes to complete. It attempts to measure personality attributes. The purpose of the Adjective Check List and the demographic information form are to compile data regarding your person so that I will be able to determine which of your characteristics are related to your peer nomination position.

Let me hasten to say that the forms you complete for this study are completely confidential. Your name and the information concerning you will not be revealed to anyone nor will any names be reported in a description of the research. I assure you that this promise of confidentiality will not be violated for any reason. When you have completed the enclosed forms, please utilize the stamped, addressed envelope and mail them at your earliest convenience.

Again, I am very appreciative of your cooperation. I would have been unable to conduct this study without your participation. I hope that through this study we have made a positive contribution to educational leadership and the behavioral sciences.

Sincerely,

Brent Knight
Doctoral Candidate, W.M.U.

1186 River Valley Drive
Flint, Michigan 48504
November, 1970

Dear Participating Faculty Member:

A few weeks ago I asked you, and the other faculty members in your division, to nominate your peers on the basis of your perception of their status and freedom to deviate. Most of the faculty members in your division completed the nomination form. I am very appreciative of the faculty cooperation which I received in implementing the first phase of the study.

I am now attempting to gain your continued cooperation in completing the second and final phase of the research study. I have enclosed ten peer evaluation forms which I would like you to complete. The evaluations will be used, along with other data, in an attempt to relate such information to the earlier nominations.

Let me hasten to emphasize that your continued anonymity is assured and that these forms will not be revealed to anyone. Moreover, neither faculty names nor college or divisional identity will be revealed in a description of the research.

Please utilize the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope and mail the completed forms to me at your earliest convenience. I hope that through this study we will have made a positive contribution to educational leadership and the behavioral sciences. Once again, thank you for your participation and encouragement.

Sincerely,

Brent Knight
Doctoral Candidate, W.M.U.

APPENDIX D

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations

Social Science Division, College Alpha
Science Division, College Alpha
Humanities Division, College Beta
Mathematics Division, College Beta
Social Science Division, College Gamma
Mathematics Division, College Gamma

TABLE 29

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nomiations
Social Science Division
College Alpha

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1	1	1	0	
2	13	0	+13	High Nominee
3	7	3	+ 4	
4	8	5	+ 3	
5	0	3	- 3	
6	4	4	0	
7	0	5	- 5	Low Nominee
8	2	3	- 1	
9	4	1	+ 3	
10	1	2	- 1	
11	5	3	+ 2	
12	10		+10	High Nominee
13		5	- 5	
14		2	- 2	
15	5	7	- 2	
16	4	1	+ 3	
17		4	- 4	
18		6	- 6	Low Nominee
19	3	3	0	
20	1	4	- 3	
21	9		+ 9	High Nominee
22		10	-10	Low Nominee
23		8	- 8	Low Nominee
24		12	-12	Low Nominee
25	7		+ 7	High Nominee
26	17		+17	High Nominee
27		4	- 4	

TABLE 30

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations
Science Division
College Alpha

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1		6	- 6	Low Nominee
2	9		+ 9	High Nominee
3		7	- 7	Low Nominee
4		2	- 2	
5		1	- 2	
6	8		+ 8	High Nominee
7	8		+ 8	High Nominee
8	3	2	+ 1	
9	5	1	+ 4	
10	5		+ 5	
11	1	2	- 1	
12		5	- 5	
13		1	- 1	
14	3		+ 3	
15	7		+ 7	
16		1	- 1	
17	1	1	0	
18	0	0	0	
19	1		+ 1	
20	11	1	+10	High Nominee
21	11	1	+10	High Nominee
22		9	- 9	Low Nominee
23		9	- 9	Low Nominee
24		5	- 5	Low Nominee

TABLE 31

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations
Humanities Division
College Beta

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1	2		+ 2	
2	1	7	- 6	
3	13		+13	High Nominee
4	1	3	- 2	
5	5	1	+ 4	
6	4		+ 4	High Nominee
7		7	- 7	Low Nominee
8	5		+ 5	High Nominee
9	2	4	- 2	
10	4	4	0	
11		3	- 3	
12	1	7	- 6	Low Nominee
13	2		+ 2	
14		3	- 3	
15	3		+ 3	
16		9	- 9	Low Nominee
17		7	- 7	Low Nominee
18	1		+ 1	
19	13		+13	High Nominee
20	2		+ 2	
21	10	2	+ 8	High Nominee
22	2	10	- 8	Low Nominee

TABLE 32

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations, Science and Mathematics Division College Beta

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1	2	1	+ 1	
2	1	1	0	
3	3	3	0	
4	10		+10	High Nominee
5		1	- 1	
6		8	- 8	Low Nominee
7		5	- 5	
8		4	- 4	
9		4	- 4	
10	5	8	- 3	
11		6	- 6	Low Nominee
12		2	- 2	
13	6		+ 6	High Nominee
14	4		+ 4	
15	2	7	- 5	Low Nominee
16	2	1	+ 1	
17	16		+16	High Nominee
18	2	2	0	
19	2	4	- 2	
20			0	
21	9		+ 9	High Nominee
22	5		+ 5	
23	1	9	- 8	Low Nominee
24		3	- 3	
25	6		+ 6	High Nominee
26		6	- 6	Low Nominee
27			0	

TABLE 33

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations
Social Science Division
College Gamma

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1		7	- 7	Low Nominee
2	1	5	- 4	Low Nominee
3	4	1	+ 3	High Nominee
4	6		+ 6	High Nominee
5	5		+ 5	High Nominee
6	4	2	+ 2	
7	1	3	- 2	
8	3	3	0	
9			0	
10	4		+ 4	High Nominee
11		4	- 4	Low Nominee
12	8		+ 8	High Nominee
13		5	- 5	Low Nominee
14		1	- 1	
15	3		+ 3	
16	3		+ 3	
17	1	1	0	
18	3	5	- 2	
19	2	2	0	
20		4	- 4	Low Nominee

TABLE 34

Idiosyncrasy Credit Nominations, Science and Mathematics Division College Gamma

Subject Number	Number of High Nominations	Number of Low Nominations	Algebraic Sum	Designation
1	1	10	- 9	Low Nominee
2	2	3	- 1	
3	11		+11	High Nominee
4	3	3	0	
5	2	7	- 5	Low Nominee
6	4	4	0	
7	10	2	+ 8	High Nominee
8	2	3	- 1	
9	6		+ 6	High Nominee
10	1	4	- 3	
11	6	1	+ 5	
12	5	4	+ 1	
13		9	- 9	Low Nominee
14		8	- 8	Low Nominee
15	6		+ 6	High Nominee
16	6	2	+ 4	
17		5	- 5	Low Nominee
18	3	2	+ 1	
19	4	5	- 1	
20	7		+ 7	Hign Nominee

APPENDIX E

Number and Per Cent of Subject Responses

Form R Packet
Adjective Check List
Demographic Information Form

TABLE 35

Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning Form R Packets

College	Division	Number of Faculty Within Division	Number of Completed Form R Packets Returned	Per Cent of Returned Completed Form R Packets
Alpha	Social Science	27	17	66%
Alpha	Science	24	13	54%
Beta	Humanities	22	7	31%
Beta	Science and Mathematics	27	15	55%
Gamma	Social Science	20	12	60%
Gamma	Science and Mathematics	20	17	85%
	TOTAL	140	81	58%

TABLE 36

Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning
the Adjective Check List

College	Division	Total Number of Target Nominees	Total Number of Completed ACL Forms Returned	Per Cent of Returned Completed ACL Forms
Alpha	Social Science	10	9	90%
Alpha	Science	10	10	100%
Beta	Humanities	10	7	70%
Beta	Science and Mathematics	10	7	70%
Gamma	Social Science	10	7	70%
Gamma	Science and Mathematics	10	9	90%
	TOTAL	60	49	81%

TABLE 37

Number and Per Cent of Subjects Returning the Demographic Information Form

College	Division	Total Number of Target Nominees	Total Number of Completed Demographic Information Forms	Per Cent of Returned Completed Demographic Information Forms
Alpha	Social Science	10	10	100%
Alpha	Science	10	10	100%
Beta	Humanities	10	7	70%
Beta	Science and Mathematics	10	8	80%
Gamma	Social Science	10	8	80%
Gamma	Science and Mathematics	10	9	90%
	TOTAL	60	52	86%

APPENDIX F

Supplemental Analyzed Data

Form R Inter-Correlation Matrix
Form R Factor Matrix
Form R Analyzed Data
Demographic Information Form Analyzed Data
Adjective Check List Analyzed Data

TABLE 38

Form R Inter-Correlation Matrix

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00000	.65138	.50052	.53285	.50380	.21016	.57359	.33679	.37157	.10080
2	.65138	1.00000	.74353	.63570	.56528	.23701	.70298	.36504	.37096	.12392
3	.50052	.74353	1.00000	.55021	.49269	.21410	.59220	.27227	.28689	.13058
4	.53285	.63570	.55021	1.00000	.53672	.18442	.70339	.37475	.36246	.06114
5	.50380	.56528	.49269	.53672	1.00000	.37834	.57920	.30919	.32335	.18015
6	.21016	.23701	.21410	.18442	.37834	1.00000	.27601	.22097	.18868	-.13313
7	.57359	.70298	.59220	.70339	.57920	.27601	1.00000	.40379	.39214	.06167
8	.33679	.36504	.27227	.37475	.30919	.22097	.40379	1.00000	.59242	.12194
9	.37157	.37096	.28689	.36246	.32335	.18868	.39214	.59242	1.00000	.11097
10	.10080	.12392	.13058	.06114	.18015	-.13313	.06167	.12194	.11957	1.00000

TABLE 39

Form R Factor Matrix

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	.75341	-.02135	.12074
2	.85889	-.06344	.23286
3	.75831	-.08505	.31032
4	.79148	-.06257	.13290
5	.74423	-.09467	.07361
6	.38655	-.50989	-.43963
7	.84270	-.10773	.08844
8	.57762	.34898	-.57045
9	.58248	.36673	-.53896
10	.16693	.76524	.31509

TABLE 40

Form R Analyzed Data

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	A.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	Level of Sig[a]	ω^2
Task Competency - Items 1, 2, 3, 4, & 7														
College Alpha	560	620	5.65	4.24	1.00	2.04	1.00	1.43	.04	.05	19.41	1178	.0005	.24
Social Science Div.	345	335	5.56	4.28	1.13	1.40	1.06	1.18	.05	.06	14.82	678	.0005	.24
Science Division	215	285	5.80	4.19	.78	2.81	.88	1.67	.06	.09	12.77	498	.0005	.24
College Beta	455	405	5.81	4.23	1.58	2.76	1.25	1.66	.05	.08	15.78	858	.0005	.22
Humanties Division	130	150	5.50	3.76	2.26	3.71	1.50	1.92	.13	.15	8.29	278	.0005	.19
Science Division	325	255	5.94	4.51	1.26	2.01	1.12	1.41	.06	.08	13.51	578	.0005	.23
College Gamma	570	515	5.73	4.26	1.13	2.01	1.06	1.41	.04	.06	19.50	1083	.0005	.26
Social Science Div.	255	235	5.61	4.37	1.33	1.97	1.15	1.40	.07	.09	10.69	488	.0005	.18
Science Division	315	280	5.83	4.16	.95	2.02	.97	1.42	.05	.08	16.84	593	.0005	.33
Total	1585	1540	5.66	4.31	1.45	2.17	1.20	1.47	.03	.03	28.01	3123	.0005	.20

---

[a] One-tail test of significance

(Continued)

Table 40 (Continued)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	Level of Sig[a]	ω^2
						Speaking Ability - Item 5								
College Alpha	125	131	5.71	4.17	1.02	1.82	1.01	1.35	.09	.11	10.25	254	.001	.29
Social Science Div.	77	73	5.72	4.19	1.14	1.35	1.07	1.16	.12	.13	8.41	148	.001	.32
Science Division	48	58	5.68	4.15	.85	2.44	.92	1.56	.13	.20	5.97	104	.001	.24
College Beta	101	98	5.35	4.37	1.81	2.44	1.34	1.56	.13	.15	4.73	197	.001	.10
Humanities Division	29	33	5.37	3.69	1.67	2.96	1.29	1.72	.24	.29	4.29	60	.001	.21
Science Division	72	65	5.34	4.72	1.89	1.85	1.37	1.36	.16	.16	2.66	135	.001	.04
College Gamma	124	118	5.70	4.53	1.21	2.01	1.10	1.41	.09	.13	7.16	240	.001	.18
Social Division	55	49	5.67	4.81	1.63	2.15	1.27	1.46	.17	.20	3.18	102	.001	.07
Science Division	69	69	5.72	4.33	.90	1.84	.95	1.35	.11	.16	6.96	136	.001	.25
Total	350	347	5.60	4.35	1.33	2.07	1.15	1.43	.06	.07	12.64	695	.001	.18
						Appearance and Grooming - Item 6								
College Alpha	124	131	5.41	4.91	1.82	1.89	1.35	1.37	.12	.12	2.94	253	.01	.02
Social Science Div.	77	75	5.36	5.25	2.28	1.94	1.51	1.39	.17	.16	.46	150	ns	.00
Science Division	47	56	5.51	4.46	1.08	1.48	1.03	1.22	.15	.16	4.63	101	.001	.16
College Beta	100	97	5.09	5.22	2.18	1.63	1.47	1.27	.14	.12	.69	195	.50	.00
Humanities Division	29	33	3.93	5.18	2.63	2.40	1.62	1.55	.30	.26	3.10	60	.01	.12
Science Division	71	64	5.56	5.25	1.24	1.26	1.11	1.12	.13	.14	1.62	133	.20	.00
College Gamma	129	123	5.56	5.30	1.63	1.34	1.27	1.15	.11	.10	1.72	250	.10	.00
Social Science Div.	55	50	5.50	5.32	2.36	1.60	1.53	1.26	.20	.17	.68	103	.50	.00
Science Division.	74	73	5.60	5.28	1.11	1.17	1.05	1.08	.12	.12	1.81	145	.10	.01
Total	352	351	5.36	5.13	1.97	1.64	1.40	1.28	.07	.06	2.26	701	.05	.00

---

[a] Two-tail test of significance

TABLE 40 (Concluded)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	Level of Sig[a]	ω^2
External Status - Items 8, 9														
College Alpha	214	236	5.01	3.19	1.90	2.07	1.38	1.44	.09	.09	13.70	448	.0005	.29
Social Science Div.	128	130	4.93	3.16	1.96	1.56	1.40	1.25	.12	.10	10.69	256	.0005	.30
Science Division	86	106	5.13	3.21	1.81	2.72	1.34	1.65	.14	.16	8.70	190	.0005	.28
College Beta	124	116	5.07	3.74	1.48	2.69	1.21	1.64	.10	.15	7.16	238	.0005	.18
Humanities Division	42	50	4.92	3.76	1.62	3.61	1.27	1.90	.19	.26	3.39	90	.0005	.10
Science Division	82	66	5.14	3.72	1.41	2.04	1.18	1.43	.13	.17	6.59	146	.0005	.21
College Gamma	124	126	4.96	3.86	2.69	2.38	1.64	1.54	.14	.13	5.46	248	.0005	.10
Social Science Div.	66	66	4.74	4.06	2.59	1.84	1.61	1.35	.19	.16	2.63	130	.005	.04
Science Division	58	60	5.22	3.65	2.73	2.94	1.65	1.71	.21	.22	5.07	116	.0005	.17
Total	462	478	5.01	3.50	1.99	2.39	1.41	1.54	.06	.07	15.67	938	.0005	.20
Idiosyncratic Behavior - Item 10														
College Alpha	125	135	3.93	2.82	2.94	2.56	1.71	1.60	.15	.13	5.41	258	.0005	.09
Social Science Div.	79	76	3.81	2.76	3.15	2.42	1.77	1.55	.19	.17	3.89	153	.0005	.07
Science Division	45	60	4.11	2.95	2.55	2.89	1.59	1.70	.23	.21	3.55	103	.0005	.09
College Beta	100	89	2.89	2.53	4.17	2.63	2.04	1.62	.20	.17	1.29	187	.10	.00
Humanities Division	30	33	5.40	2.06	2.45	2.30	1.56	1.51	.28	.26	8.58	61	.0005	.53
Science Division	69	57	1.82	2.78	1.05	2.66	1.02	1.63	.12	.21	4.02	124	.0005	.10
College Gamma	117	110	3.70	3.19	2.83	1.66	1.68	1.28	.15	.12	2.55	225	.01	.02
Social Science Div.	54	46	3.70	3.15	3.57	1.99	1.88	1.43	.25	.20	1.62	98	.10	.01
Science Division	63	64	3.69	3.21	2.24	1.44	1.49	1.20	.18	.15	1.99	125	.025	.02
Total	342	334	3.27	3.14	3.24	2.76	1.80	1.66	.09	.09	.83	674	.25	.00

---

[a] One-Tail test of significance

TABLE 41

Demographic Information Form Analyzed Data

Unit	N	Data Based Mean High	Data Based Mean Low	U	U'	Computational Mean	St Dev	Z	p[a]
Number of College Degrees - Item 7									
College Alpha	20	2.30	2.10	65.00	35.00	50.00	13.23	1.13	.24
College Beta	16	2.28	2.12	32.50	23.50	28.00	8.64	.52	.44
College Gamma	16	2.25	1.85	38.00	18.00	28.00	8.64	1.15	.16
Total	50	2.28	2.00	396.50	228.50	312.50	51.54	1.63	.10
Number of Academic Honors - Item 8									
College Alpha	20	.80	1.60	36.00	64.00	50.00	13.23	-1.05	.28
College Beta	16	.62	.50	32.50	31.50	32.00	9.52	.05	ns
College Gamma	16	.87	.28	32.50	23.50	28.00	8.64	.52	.44
Total	52	.76	.88	309.00	341.00	325.00	53.07	-.30	ns
Number of Job Related Professional Organizations - Item 9									
College Alpha	20	3.20	3.00	54.50	45.50	50.00	13.23	.34	.72
College Beta	16	1.62	3.25	13.00	51.00	32.00	9.52	-1.99	.05
College Gamma	16	2.87	1.83	33.00	15.00	24.00	7.75	1.16	.08
Total	52	2.61	2.79	299.50	324.50	312.00	51.50	-.24	.80
Number of Published Journal Articles - Item 11									
College Alpha	20	1.22	.10	67.50	22.50	45.00	12.25	1.83	.10
College Beta	16	1.25	1.00	36.00	28.00	32.00	9.52	.42	.32
College Gamma	16	2.75	.14	45.50	10.50	28.00	8.64	2.02	.02
Total	52	1.72	.36	424.50	200.50	312.50	51.54	2.17	.03

[a] Two-tail test of significance

(continued)

TABLE 41 (Continued)

Unit	N	Data Based Mean High	Data Based Mean Low	U	U'	Computational Mean	St Dev	Z	p[a]
Number of Published Books or Monographs - Item 12									
College Alpha	20	1.00	.10	65.50	34.50	50.00	13.23	1.17	.24
College Beta	16	.12	.37	24.00	40.00	32.00	9.52	.84	.44
College Gamma	16	.25	.14	31.00	25.00	28.00	8.64	.34	.50
Total	52	.46	.20	347.50	302.50	325.00	53.07	.42	.66
Number of Memberships Held in Social, Community, or Church Organizations - Item 13									
College Alpha	20	2.40	1.50	63.50	36.50	50.00	13.23	1.02	.30
College Beta	16	.50	1.00	21.00	43.00	32.00	9.52	-1.15	.26
College Gamma	16	1.37	.57	40.00	16.00	28.00	8.64	1.38	.10
Total	52	1.50	1.08	360.50	289.50	325.00	53.07	.66	.50
Number of Offices Held in Social, Community, or Church Organizations - Item 13									
College Alpha	20	1.40	1.00	55.50	44.50	50.00	13.23	.41	.68
College Beta	16	.25	.62	27.00	37.00	32.00	9.52	-.52	.64
College Gamma	16	.37	1.37	46.50	17.50	32.00	9.52	1.52	.16
Total	52	1.03	.69	382.00	294.00	338.00	54.64	.80	.42
Number of Memberships Held in College Committees - Item 14									
College Alpha	20	2.40	1.20	79.50	20.50	50.00	13.23	2.23	.05
College Beta	16	1.00	1.62	21.00	43.00	32.00	9.52	-1.15	.26
College Gamma	16	.50	.71	16.00	40.00	28.00	8.64	-1.38	.10
Total	52	1.38	1.20	353.50	296.50	325.00	53.07	.53	.59

[a] Two-tail test of significance

TABLE 41 (Continued)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	Level of Sig[a]	ω^2
Age - Item 2														
College Alpha	10	10	39.70	35.80	76.23	134.39	8.73	11.59	2.76	3.66	.85	18	.50	.00
College Beta	8	8	34.62	39.62	34.26	72.83	5.85	8.53	2.06	3.01	1.36	14	.20	.05
College Gamma	8	7	40.87	35.71	103.55	40.57	10.17	6.36	3.59	2.40	1.15	13	.50	.02
Total	26	25	38.50	37.00	73.22	85.16	8.55	9.22	1.67	1.84	.60	49	ns	.00
Duration of Affiliation - Item 5														
College Alpha	10	10	4.80	3.90	5.73	8.54	2.92	2.39	.75	.92	.75	18	.25[b]	.00
College Beta	8	8	6.00	6.62	3.14	.83	1.77	.91	.62	.32	.53	14	.40	.00
College Gamma	8	7	3.87	3.14	1.26	1.47	1.12	1.21	.39	.45	1.21	13	.25[b]	.03
Total	26	25	4.88	4.24	4.02	4.85	2.00	2.20	.39	.44	1.09	49	.25[b]	.00

[a] Two-tail test of significance

[b] One-tail test of significance

TABLE 41 (Concluded)

	Male	Female	Total	X^2	df	p^a	C
Sex of the Nominees - Item 3							
Number of High Nominees	28	2	30				
Number of Low Nominees	21	9	30				
Total	49	11	60				
Value				3.98	1	.10	.06

[a] Two-tail test of significance

TABLE 42

Adjective Check List Analyzed Data

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	p[a]	ω^2
Number of Adjectives Checked														
College Alpha	9	10	42.44	46.20	48.52	88.40	6.96	9.40	2.32	2.97	.97	17	.50	.00
College Beta	6	8	53.00	52.37	367.60	66.55	19.17	8.15	7.82	2.83	.08	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	42.00	46.57	77.42	61.95	8.79	7.87	3.11	2.97	1.05	13	.50	.00
Total	23	25	45.04	48.28	149.22	76.29	12.21	8.73	2.54	1.74	1.06	46	.50	.00
Number of Favorable Adjectives Checked														
College Alpha	9	10	50.22	50.70	162.44	47.12	12.74	6.86	4.24	2.17	.10	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	50.83	54.62	82.96	107.12	9.10	10.35	3.71	3.65	.71	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	48.75	46.85	68.78	97.14	8.29	9.85	2.93	3.72	.40	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	49.86	50.88	100.57	82.60	10.02	9.08	2.09	1.81	.36	46	ns	.00
Number of Unfavorable Adjectives Checked														
College Alpha	9	10	46.44	48.00	81.27	41.11	9.01	6.41	3.00	2.02	.43	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	49.66	50.75	105.46	192.46	10.26	13.88	4.19	4.90	.16	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	50.50	48.00	152.57	74.66	12.35	8.64	4.36	3.26	.44	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	48.69	48.88	105.58	92.02	10.27	9.59	2.14	1.91	.06	46	ns	.00
Self Confidence														
College Alpha	9	10	57.22	50.50	177.94	140.94	13.33	11.87	4.44	3.75	1.16	17	.40	.01
College Beta	6	8	56.20	56.12	162.40	89.55	12.74	9.46	5.20	3.34	.02	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	56.00	43.00	114.85	227.00	10.71	15.06	3.78	5.69	1.94	13	.10	.16
Total	23	25	56.47	50.20	138.53	162.58	11.77	12.75	2.45	2.55	1.76	46	.10	.04

[a] Two-tail test of significance

(Continued)

TABLE 42 (Continued)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	p[a]	ω^2
Need for Heterosexuality														
College Alpha	9	10	54.66	40.90	138.25	195.65	11.75	13.98	3.91	4.42	2.30	17	.05	.18
College Beta	6	8	53.50	50.62	148.30	227.69	12.17	15.08	4.97	5.33	.38	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	47.25	49.28	61.64	74.57	7.85	8.63	2.77	3.26	.47	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	51.78	46.36	115.26	179.40	10.73	13.39	2.23	2.67	1.53	46	.20	.02
Need for Exhibition														
College Alpha	9	10	52.11	46.30	61.61	195.56	7.84	13.98	2.61	4.42	1.09	17	.50	.01
College Beta	6	8	53.66	50.87	244.26	34.12	15.62	5.84	6.38	2.06	.46	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	55.00	44.14	129.42	219.80	11.37	14.82	4.02	5.60	1.60	13	.20	.09
Total	23	25	53.52	47.16	120.71	145.80	10.98	12.07	2.29	2.41	1.90	46	.10	.05
Need for Autonomy														
College Alpha	9	10	48.55	48.80	55.02	219.28	7.41	14.80	2.47	4.68	.045	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	53.16	47.25	240.16	121.35	15.40	11.00	6.32	3.89	.838	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	55.12	51.57	249.26	165.61	15.78	12.86	5.58	4.86	.473	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	52.04	49.08	162.67	161.99	12.75	12.72	2.65	2.54	.80	46	.50	.00
Need for Aggression														
College Alpha	9	10	51.55	48.30	67.02	133.78	8.18	11.56	2.72	3.65	.70	17	.50	.00
College Beta	6	8	51.50	50.37	153.10	157.98	12.37	12.56	5.50	4.44	.16	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	56.75	46.00	151.07	170.00	12.29	13.03	4.34	4.92	1.64	13	.20	.10
Total	23	25	53.34	48.32	113.69	141.72	10.62	11.90	2.22	2.38	1.53	46	.20	.02
Need for Change														
College Alpha	9	10	47.88	49.30	64.11	166.89	8.03	12.91	2.67	4.08	.282	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	45.00	45.37	155.20	57.20	12.45	7.55	5.08	2.67	.070	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	47.37	46.42	191.98	52.61	13.85	7.25	4.89	2.74	.162	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	46.95	47.24	121.31	95.52	11.01	9.77	2.29	1.95	.09	46	ns	.00

[a] Two-tail test of significance

TABLE 42 (Continued)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	p^a	ω^2
					Need for Endurance									
College Alpha	9	10	59.55	54.10	76.02	160.32	8.71	12.66	2.90	4.00	1.08	17	.50	.00
College Beta	6	8	54.50	59.25	58.30	69.35	7.63	8.32	3.11	2.94	1.09	12	ns	.01
College Gamma	8	7	58.00	48.57	145.14	14.61	12.04	3.82	4.25	1.44	1.97	13	.10	.16
Total	23	25	57.69	54.20	91.31	101.75	9.55	10.08	1.99	2.01	1.23	46	.50	.01
					Need for Order									
College Alpha	9	10	55.55	54.00	103.27	172.88	10.16	13.14	3.38	4.15	.28	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	55.00	60.75	75.20	57.92	8.67	7.61	3.54	2.69	1.31	12	.20	.05
College Gamma	8	7	54.25	48.14	285.35	45.47	16.89	6.74	5.97	2.54	.89	13	.50	.00
Total	23	25	54.95	54.52	145.77	118.01	12.07	10.86	2.51	2.17	.13	46	ns	.00
					Need for Intraception									
College Alpha	9	10	55.11	59.10	195.61	48.09	13.98	6.93	4.66	2.19	.80	17	.50	.00
College Beta	6	8	49.83	56.50	116.96	175.14	10.81	13.23	4.41	4.67	1.00	12	.50$_b$	.00
College Gamma	8	7	55.62	54.57	213.69	40.61	14.61	6.37	5.16	2.40	.17	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	53.91	57.00	171.90	82.91	13.11	9.10	2.73	1.82	.95	46	.50	.00
					Need for Nurturance									
College Alpha	9	10	52.88	54.30	93.61	78.45	9.67	8.85	3.22	2.80	.33	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	48.83	52.12	151.76	374.98	12.31	19.36	5.02	6.84	.36	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	47.75	53.71	136.50	132.23	11.68	11.49	4.13	4.34	.99	13	.50	.00
Total	23	25	50.04	53.44	117.58	172.75	10.84	13.14	2.26	2.62	.97	46	.50	.00
					Need for Affiliation									
College Alpha	9	10	52.22	49.20	125.19	44.84	11.18	6.69	3.72	2.11	.72	17	.25	.00
College Beta	6	8	50.66	53.25	43.46	125.92	6.59	11.22	2.69	3.96	.50	12	ns$_b$	.00
College Gamma	8	7	45.62	45.28	35.41	188.57	5.94	13.73	2.10	5.19	.06	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	49.52	49.40	75.53	110.58	8.69	10.51	1.81	2.10	.04	46	ns^b	.00

[a] Two-tail test of significance

[b] One-tail test of significance

TABLE 42 (Continued)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	p[a]	ω^2
					Self Control									
College Alpha	9	10	47.66	50.10	118.75	130.32	10.89	11.41	3.63	3.61	.47	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	49.00	53.37	98.80	81.41	9.93	9.02	4.05	3.19	.86	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	44.50	44.71	140.28	127.57	11.84	11.29	4.18	4.26	.03	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	46.91	49.64	113.81	116.32	10.66	10.78	2.22	2.15	.88	46	.50	.00
					Lability									
College Alpha	9	10	53.11	52.90	257.61	170.76	16.05	13.06	5.35	4.13	.032	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	54.16	55.00	169.76	92.28	13.02	9.60	5.31	3.39	.138	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	56.37	54.85	257.41	118.80	16.04	10.89	5.67	4.11	.211	13	ns	.00
Total	23	25	54.52	54.12	216.26	121.69	14.70	11.03	3.06	2.20	.108	46	ns	.00
					Personal Adjustment									
College Alpha	9	10	48.88	51.60	165.11	70.26	12.84	8.38	4.28	2.65	.55	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	49.50	53.00	43.10	109.71	6.56	10.47	2.68	3.70	.71	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	46.12	49.57	80.98	53.61	8.99	7.32	3.18	2.76	.80	13	.50	.00
Total	23	25	48.08	51.48	97.81	73.59	9.88	8.57	2.06	1.71	1.27	46	.50	.01
					Need for Achievement									
College Alpha	9	10	62.22	53.90	163.69	45.21	12.79	6.72	4.26	2.12	1.80	17	.10	.10
College Beta	6	8	56.00	62.37	61.60	107.69	7.84	10.37	3.20	3.66	1.25	12	.50	.04
College Gamma	8	7	57.12	48.00	76.12	138.66	8.72	11.77	3.08	4.45	1.72	13	.12	.11
Total	23	25	58.82	54.96	105.69	115.95	10.28	10.76	2.14	2.15	1.27	46	.50	.01
					Need for Dominance									
College Alpha	9	10	59.22	52.00	95.19	109.33	9.75	10.45	3.25	3.30	1.55	17	.20	.07
College Beta	6	8	54.33	59.37	171.46	104.26	13.09	10.21	5.34	3.61	.81	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	59.25	44.28	67.92	213.23	8.24	14.60	2.91	5.51	2.48	13	.05	.25
Total	23	25	57.95	52.20	100.04	160.16	10.00	12.65	2.08	2.53	1.73	46	.10	.04

[a] Two-tail test of significance

TABLE 42 (Concluded)

Unit	No High	No Low	Mean High	Mean Low	Var High	Var Low	S.D. High	S.D. Low	SEM High	SEM Low	T Val	D F	p[a]	ω^2
					Need for Succorance									
College Alpha	9	10	45.55	46.80	117.02	96.62	10.81	9.82	3.60	3.10	.26	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	45.33	42.50	84.66	28.00	9.20	5.29	3.75	1.88	.73	12	.50	.00
College Gamma	8	7	43.87	50.28	26.41	119.90	5.33	10.95	1.88	4.13	1.47	13	.10	.07
Total	23	25	44.91	46.40	71.44	83.91	8.45	9.16	1.76	1.83	.58	46	ns	.00
					Need for Abasement									
College Alpha	9	10	43.55	49.90	28.77	139.65	5.36	11.81	1.78	3.73	1.47	17	.20	.05
College Beta	6	8	44.66	45.12	131.06	91.26	11.44	9.55	4.67	3.37	.08	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	44.00	50.57	75.71	137.28	8.70	11.71	3.07	4.42	1.24	13	.50	.03
Total	23	25	44.00	48.56	64.54	119.17	8.03	10.91	1.67	2.18	1.63	46	.15	.03
					Need for Deference									
College Alpha	9	10	47.00	50.10	81.50	214.32	9.02	14.63	3.00	4.62	.54	17	ns	.00
College Beta	6	8	48.00	48.62	215.60	111.41	14.68	10.55	5.99	3.73	.09	12	ns	.00
College Gamma	8	7	42.12	53.28	153.26	201.90	12.38	14.20	4.37	5.37	1.62	13	.15	.10
Total	23	25	45.56	50.52	134.16	166.84	11.58	12.91	2.41	2.58	1.39	46	.20	.01

---

[a] Two-tail test of significance